A4425-24 4/89

SPECIAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA'S CITIES

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

The Council of the Great City Schools
1413 K. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

1988

Sponsored by
The Council of the Great City Schools
Special Education Directors Steering Committee

William Malloy, Milwaukee, Chairperson
Edward Friedlander, Baltimore
Keith Kromer, Minneapolis
Theodore Lewis, Chicago
Wylamerle Marshall, Dade County
William Penn, Pittsburgh
Win Tillery, Philadelphia
Ruth Turner, Dallas
Edward Vargas, Seattle
Venetta Whitaker, Los Angeles
Paul Woods, Washington, DC

Conducted by
Research for Better Schools

Joan L. Buttram
Keith M. Kershner

444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the input, support, and encouragement of a large number of people. The Council of the Great City Schools Special Education Steering Committee, including Edward Friedlander, Keith Kromer, Theodore Lewis, Wylamerle Marshall, William Penn, Win Tillery, Ruth Turner, Edward Vargas, Venetta Whitaker, and Paul Woods contributed greatly in shaping the study and interpreting the results. William Malloy, who chairs the Special Education Steering Committee, was especially helpful in organizing and reacting to the vast amount of data collected. Samuel Husk, Executive Director of the Council of the Great City Schools, and the Council's directors of research and evaluation also provided assistance in shaping the focus of the study at the very beginning. The individual special education directors and staff of the 33 districts that participated in the study deserve a special thanks for the countless hours spent gathering the data. In addition, the funding for the study was provided by the following individual Council districts -- Baltimore, Chicago, Columbus, Dallas, Houston, Indianapolis, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Diego, Seattle, Tucson, and Washington, D.C. Without the enthusiastic support and cooperation of all of these individuals, our work would not have been possible.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

School board members, superintendents, other educators, and legislators have raised numerous questions about the management, operation, and effectiveness of special education programs in urban districts. The answers to their questions were frequently missing or based on school district staff perceptions because insufficient information was available. In 1985, the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) authorized a study to remedy this situation. The CGCS directors of special education and research initiated the study and Research for Better Schools (RBS) agreed to collaborate in its design and conduct.

During the first phase of the study, data were collected on 1984-85 special education students, facilities, budgets, referrals, evaluation, vocational participation, and related services. These descriptive data were summarized in a report that was presented and well-received at the 1986 CGCS annual meeting in New York City.

The success of the first effort in combination with the questions left unanswered led the special education directors to extend the study another year. This second phase added longitudinal data for 1985-86 and 1986-87 and several new variables -- complaints and hearings, integration with regular education, criteria for evaluating student progress, and policy and program recommendations.

This report focuses on the second study phase. Summaries of the study findings and recommendations are presented below.

Study Findings

Some popular speculations about special education programs were comfirmed by the study's findings. However, other widely held perceptions were refuted. The findings are summarized below.

Stability of Special Education Enrollments and Costs

Little increase was found in the number of students enrolled in special education programs overall as well as in three of the larger handicapped classifications -- mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled. Special education students constituted approximately 10.5 percent of district enrollments during the three study years, slightly lower than the national average reported by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education. Regarding costs, the annual per student increases were slightly higher for special education than for regular education. Special education increases were near 10 percent while regular education increases approximated 8 percent. Contrary to expectations, the data did not point to any uncontrolled upward spiraling of student enrollments or costs related to special education.

Referral and Placement of Students in Special Education Programs

Although these data were less complete than was hoped, the results showed that CGCS districts have made substantial progress in reducing the number of inappropriate referrals to special education programs. Districts informally reported that these improvements seem to be tied to the institution of pre-referral procedures that require schools to explore regular education alternatives to address students' needs prior to their formal referral to special education for testing. Given the costs of testing, the indicated reductions of 3 to 8 percent in the number of

inappropriate referrals quickly translate into sizable savings.

Special Education Complaints and Hearings

Only five cities reported significant numbers of complaints, and three of the five are the largest school districts in the country. Over half of the districts reported five or fewer complaints each year. Most complaints were settled prior to formal hearings and when hearings did occur, school districts generally prevailed.

Evaluation of Special Education Programs

Special education directors indicated that most evaluation resources currently were devoted to ensuring that district programs comply with federal and state regulations. If these requirements were lessened, more evaluation resources could be devoted to identifying and determining the effectiveness of different strategies in meeting handicapped students' needs.

In order to carry out these latter types of evaluations, more attention would have to be given to measures to assess handicapped student progress. The evaluation criteria currently used by districts center around "return to general education" or "graduate from high school", but these criteria are only suitable for a small proportion of the handicapped student population. The directors expressed interest in looking at more growth-oriented criteria such as the development of academic, vocational, and self-help competencies. However, research first must be completed on the development of such growth indicators before they can be used to assess handicapped student progress.

Integration of Special and Regular Education Programs

Most special education students were enrolled in school buildings with both special and regular education programs. Very few handicapped students

were assigned to programs in segregated settings. CGCS districts tended to use one common referral system to identify students that require additional help -- from either special education or other district programs. In addition, instructional materials were shared by special education and regular education, and extracurricular activities were open to both groups of students. However, special education and regular education did not use the same student progress reporting system.

Special education has consistently reached out to regular education in providing training, technical assistance, and follow-up to regular education staff. Regular education staff have routinely participated in interviews of special education candidates. In contrast, regular education less often provided training to special education staff, included special education staff in grade level or department groupings, or located the special education department in the central office instructional division. These results suggest that attempts initiated by special education staff to integrate special and regular education programs have not been fully reciprocated by regular education staff.

Policy and Program Recommendations

Special education directors were asked to rank the importance of various policy and programmatic recommendations. In terms of the former, the recommendations concerning integration of special and regular education and increased funding for special education programs were ranked highest. Highest on the programmatic list were programs for the severely emotionally disturbed students, integration programs for mildly handicapped and regular education students, and preschool and vocational programs for handicapped students. These responses lend further support to the importance given by

special educators to the integration of special and regular education.

Recommendations

Four recommendations are presented for the consideration of CGCS school board members, superintendents, special educators, and other policymakers. These recommendations are based on the findings summarized above.

1. Continue exploring options for integrating special education programs for the mildly handicapped with regular education programs, giving particular emphasis to involving regular education actively.

The study findings affirm the importance and support given by special educators to the integration of special education programs for mildly handicapped students with regular education programs. The data further suggest that these efforts, to date, have not been reciprocated at the same intensity by regular education. To be successful, future efforts must include regular education staff from the initial planning to the actual implementation.

2. Provide for centralized recordkeeping so that special education directors can monitor and manage their program operations effectively.

In collecting the data for both phases of this study, it often was surprising how much information was not available to special education directors and their staffs. Many reported that records for their programs, or key components, have been decentralized and so access to information is difficult. For example, over half of the districts did not have information on the number of referrals to special education each year. Others had great difficulty obtaining budget information on the costs of their programs. Nevertheless, many special education programs are being held accountable for managing and overseeing these and other areas without access to necessary

information. District specialists in management information systems and accounting should work closely with special education directors to ensure their access to information necessary to the effective and efficient management of their programs.

3. Expand special education evaluation activities to assess handicapped student progress.

One of the precipitating concerns for the CGCS's examination of special education programs was the perceived lack of any measure of student achievement. Both rounds of data collection confirmed the lack of achievement data on handicapped students. However, the results of the second round of data collection suggest that special education programs are eager to collect such data. Unfortunately, it is not a simple matter of making a commitment to collect data on handicapped student progress. Research is needed to develop, field test, and validate appropriate indicators and measures. Special educators and other school officials must begin to call attention to this need and insist that the necessary development be completed.

4. Increase communication between special educators in school districts and federal policymakers so that research priorities reflect special education needs.

A number of issues have been identified that are critical to the future of special education programs, from the development of measures to assess handicapped student progress to the need for programs for severely emotionally disturbed students. The federal government each year allocates research dollars to investigate various special education issues. School district special educators and other school officials need to communicate their priorities more effectively and work closely with federal policymakers to make sure that federal dollars are given to support these priorities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	STUDY FINDINGS	5
	Stability of Special Education Programs	6
	Referral and Placement in Special Education Programs	15
	Special Education Complaints and Hearings	18
	Special Education Program Evaluation	20
	Integration of Special and Regular Education	23
	Special Education Policy and Program Recommendations	30
III.	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
	Study Findings	33
	Recommendations	37
IV.	REFERENCES	41
	APPENDIX A: STUDY METHODOLOGY	A-1
	APPENDIX B: STUDENT ENROLLMENTS	B-1
	APPENDIX C: FISCAL DATA	C-1
	APPENDIX D: STUDENT REFERRAL AND PLACEMENT DATA	D-1
	APPENDIX E: COMPLAINT AND HEARING DATA	E-1
	APPENDIX F: EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	F-1
	APPENDIX G: INTEGRATION WITH REGULAR EDUCATION	G-1
	APPENDIX H: RECOMMENDATIONS	H-1
	APPENDIX I: SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF	I-1
	APPENDIX J: STUDENT EXIT DATA	J-1
	APPENDIX K: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DATA	K-1

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments in Special Education Programs	7
2.	Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments in Mentally Retarded Special Education Programs	8
3.	Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments in Emotionally Disturbed Special Education Programs	9
4.	Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments in Learning Disability Special Education Programs	10
5.	Annual Increase in Per Student Expenditures for Special and Regular Education Programs	14
6.	Annual Percentage of Students Who Were Referred and Then Placed in Special Education Programs	16
7.	Number of Special Education Complaints That Ended in Hearings	19
8.	Special Education Evaluation Activities	20
9.	Special Education Evaluation Criteria	22
10.	Percent of School Buildings With Special and/or Regular Education Programs	24
11.	Percent of Special Education Students Placed in Segregated and LRE School Settings	25
12.	Participation in Staff Integration Activities	27
13.	Participation in Student Integration Activities	28
14.	Number of Activities to Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff and Students	29
15.	Rankings of Special Education Policy-Level Recommendations	30
16.	Rankings of Special Education Programmatic Needs	32

B-1. Annual Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21)..... B-1

B-2. Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21) in District Versus Contract-Operated Programs..... B-2

B-3. Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21) by Handicap in 1984-85..... B-3

B-4. Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21) by Handicap in 1985-86..... B-4

B-5. Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21) by Handicap in 1986-87..... B-5

C-1. Annual Per Student Dollar Expenditures for Special and Regular Education Programs..... C-1

D-1. Annual Special Education Student Referrals and Subsequent Placements..... D-1

E-1. Number of Special Education Hearings and Complaints..... E-1

E-2. Reasons for Special Education Complaints 1984-85..... E-2

E-3. Reasons for Special Education Complaints 1985-86..... E-3

E-4. Reasons for Special Education Complaints 1986-87..... E-4

E-5. School District Provision of Legal Services..... E-5

F-1. School District Special Education Evaluation Activities in 1985-86..... F-1

F-2. School District Special Education Evaluation Activities in 1986-87..... F-2

F-3. Future School District Special Education Evaluation Activities..... F-3

F-4. School District Special Education Evaluation Criteria in 1985-86..... F-4

F-5. School District Special Education Evaluation Criteria in 1986-87..... F-5

F-6. Future School District Special Education Evaluation Criteria..... F-6

G-1. Number of School Buildings with Special and/ or Regular Education Programs in 1985-86..... G-1

G-2. Number of School Buildings with Special and/or Regular Education Programs in 1986-87..... G-2

G-3. Special Education Student Enrollments in Different School Settings in 1985-86..... G-3

G-4. Special Education Student Enrollments in Different School Settings in 1986-87..... G-4

G-5. School District Activities that Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff in 1984-85..... G-5

G-6. School District Activities that Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff in 1985-86..... G-6

G-7. School District Activities that Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff in 1986-87..... G-7

G-8. School District Activities that Integrate Special and Regular Education Students in 1984-85..... G-8

G-9. School District Activities that Integrate Special and Regular Education Students in 1985-86..... G-9

G-10. School District Activities that Integrate Special and Regular Education Students in 1986-87..... G-10

H-1. School District Rankings of Special Education Policy-Level Recommendations..... H-1

H-2. School District Rankings of Special Education Programmatic Needs..... H-2

H-3. Technical Assistance Resource List..... H-3

I-1. School District Special Education Staff in 1985-86..... I-1

I-2. School District Special Education Staff in 1986-87..... I-2

J-1. Reasons for Students Leaving Special Education Programs in 1984-85..... J-1

J-2. Reasons for Students Leaving Special Education Programs in 1985-86..... J-2

J-3. Reasons for Students Leaving Special Education Programs in 1986-87..... J-3

K-1. Enrollments of Special and Regular Education Students in Vocational Education Programs in 1984-85..... K-1

K-2. Enrollments of Special and Regular Education Students in Vocational Education Programs in 1985-86..... K-2

K-3. Enrollments of Special and Regular Education Students in Vocational Education Programs in 1986-87..... K-3

I. INTRODUCTION

The role of special education programs in urban school districts has received increasing attention over the past few years. This attention has arisen in response to the growing concern of school board members, superintendents, other central office administrators, and legislators about the management, operation, and effectiveness of these programs. Their concern stems, in part, from the following trends and perceptions about special education programs in urban school districts.

- Special education is continuing to grow.
- Special education is a place for all hard-to-teach students.
- Special education is preoccupied with the find/diagnose/place task.
- Special education programs do not have systematic data to support the effectiveness of their programs in increasing the achievement or improving the behavior of the placed child.
- Few students are leaving special education programs and returning to regular classrooms.
- Increasing graduation requirements, competency tasks, and expectations for student achievement may increase the numbers of students assigned to special education.
- Special education often is isolated from regular education with respect to school resources management, program planning, teacher training, and classroom instruction.
- An imbalance of resources and expertise is developing between regular and special education classrooms.

These trends are further reinforced by a feeling on the part of school officials that "special" education programs cannot be managed in the same way as "regular" education programs. Although special education programs represent a significant share of the budget in each school district, these same districts do not feel in control of special education

-- in fact, they more often feel controlled by it. Special education is often described in terms of court decisions, regulatory procedures, and feelings of intimidation, rather than the quality of programs and services being provided to special needs students.

In 1985, the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) authorized an examination of this sensitive area. In response, the CGCS directors of special education and research designed a one-year study that collected descriptive data on special education programs for the preceding school year (1984-85). Research for Better Schools (RBS) collaborated in the design and conduct of the study. Data were collected on special education students; facilities; budgets; pre-referral, referral, placement, and exit from special education programs; program evaluation; vocational education; and related services. The results of this effort (Phase 1) were presented to the CGCS Board of Directors in 1986 at their annual meeting in New York City (Buttram, Kershner, & Rioux, 1986).

Although the results of the first round of data collection produced important answers regarding the status of urban special education programs, other questions were raised that could not be answered without data for multiple school years. The special education directors thus decided to extend the study and collect data on the 1985-86 and 1986-87 school years (Phase 2). Data were collected on many of the same variables cited above as well as on critical issues identified in the first phase, including special education complaints and hearings, the integration of special and regular education, criteria for evaluating handicapped student progress, and policy and program recommendations.

This document summarizes the results of the study. The next chapter presents the major findings, organized around six underlying themes. These themes reflect the findings of both Phase 1 and Phase 2 data collection; they represent the major findings of the multi-year effort. The final chapter presents recommendations for the CGCS to consider. The appendices describe the study's methodology in detail (Appendix A) and present the data in more complete form (Appendices B through K). An executive summary is provided at the beginning of this report.

II. STUDY FINDINGS

During the course of the study, a wealth of information has been gathered by the CGCS on special education programs in urban school districts -- the characteristics of handicapped student populations, the organization and management of school district programs to serve handicapped students, the integration of special and regular education programs, and the critical issues facing special education programs. Rather than describe this information base in terms of the large number of individual variables included in the study, the data have been organized around six underlying themes. These themes reflect the major findings of this multi-year study effort and often shed light on what often turns out to be mistaken perceptions concerning the status of special education in urban districts. The data also frequently present challenges which educators and policymakers at all levels -- national, state, and local -- must begin to face in the provision of special education programs to handicapped students. The six themes are listed below:

- the stability of school district enrollments and funding for special education programs
- the referral and subsequent placement of students in special education programs
- the incidence of complaints and hearings in relation to school districts' provision of special education services to handicapped students
- the impact of federal and state regulations on the focus and resources for evaluating special education programs
- the integration of special and regular education programs to serve mildly handicapped and at-risk students
- policy and program recommendations for special education programs.

The remaining sections of this chapter discuss the study findings related to each of the six themes. Each section presents relevant statistical summaries. More extensive data tables are referenced and included in Appendices B through H to this report. The statistical summaries are accompanied by narrative discussions that define and explain the issue at hand.

Not all data collected as part of this study are presented in the body of the report. Data on special education staff and handicapped students' exit from special education programs were excluded because insufficient numbers of districts submitted information. Data on handicapped students' enrollment in vocational programs were omitted because of difficulties in defining "vocational education" consistently across all districts. These data are included in Appendices I, J, and K for the interested reader. However, great care should be taken in interpreting these data for the reasons listed above.

Stability of Special Education Programs

At the onset of this effort, school board members and superintendents alike feared that special education enrollments and costs were escalating at unprecedented rates. In fact, their fear was a major factor motivating the initial phase of the CGCS study. In order to examine this issue more fully, data were collected on the number of students enrolled in special education programs during the 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87 school years. Annual special education enrollment data are summarized in Table 1. Tables 2, 3, and 4 respectively present district enrollments in three of the largest special education classifications -- mentally retarded, emotionally

Table 1

Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments
in Special Education Programs

District	1984-85 Percent	1985-86 Percent	1986-87 Percent
Atlanta	Unk	6.7	5.6
Baltimore	16.3	15.7	16.0
Chicago	7.7	11.0	11.2
Cleveland	7.7	10.1	10.8
Columbus	10.0	10.2	10.2
Dade County	9.6	10.2	Unk
Dallas	6.9	7.1	6.8
Denver	8.3	7.5	8.4
Fresno	Unk	8.4	8.6
Houston	Unk	7.8	8.8
Indianapolis	13.8	13.2	12.4
Long Beach	6.5	6.4	6.4
Los Angeles	8.3	7.8	7.9
Memphis	11.5	9.5	9.4
Milwaukee	9.7	9.6	9.7
Minneapolis	13.0	12.6	12.6
Nashville	9.2	9.9	11.9
New Orleans	11.4	8.1	7.4
New York City	11.9	11.9	11.3
Norfolk	Unk	11.2	10.1
Omaha	13.5	13.7	13.1
Philadelphia	12.6	11.3	11.6
Phoenix	Unk	11.0	10.7
Pittsburgh	14.8	16.2	13.4
Rochester	14.3	14.7	14.7
San Diego	Unk	9.7	9.6
San Francisco	9.5	9.0	8.3
Seattle	10.5	9.8	10.0
St. Paul	15.2	14.9	14.9
Tucson	Unk	9.6	9.2
Tulsa	12.7	12.9	12.7
Wake County	Unk	9.6	9.8
Washington, DC	7.3	8.1	8.2
Average	10.3	10.2	10.8

Note: Enrollment percentages are based on December 1st counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported.
Averages reported above exclude districts with data missing for any of the three years. See Appendix B for more complete data.

Table 2

Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments in Mentally Retarded Special Education Programs

District	1984-85 Percent	1985-86 Percent	1986-87 Percent
Atlanta	Unk	1.6	2.0
Baltimore	1.3	1.4	1.4
Chicago	1.8	1.9	1.7
Cleveland	Unk	3.3	3.5
Columbus	2.9	2.8	2.7
Dade County	0.9	Unk	Unk
Dallas	0.9	0.9	1.0
Denver	Unk	1.1	1.1
Fresno	Unk	<0.1	0.7
Houston	Unk	1.1	1.2
Indianapolis	4.8	4.4	3.8
Long Beach	0.5	0.5	0.5
Los Angeles	0.8	0.8	0.9
Memphis	Unk	2.6	2.6
Milwaukee	1.6	1.6	1.7
Minneapolis	Unk	1.5	1.5
Nashville	Unk	2.1	2.2
New York City	0.9	0.8	0.8
Norfolk	Unk	1.7	1.5
Omaha	Unk	3.0	3.0
Philadelphia	Unk	2.0	1.9
Phoenix	Unk	2.4	2.3
Pittsburgh	2.8	2.6	2.4
Rochester	Unk	2.7	2.5
San Francisco	0.9	0.7	0.6
Seattle	1.4	1.3	1.3
St. Paul	Unk	3.3	3.4
Tucson	Unk	0.9	0.9
Tulsa	Unk	2.4	2.4
Wake County	Unk	1.8	1.7
Washington, DC	1.6	1.6	1.4
Average	1.2	1.4	1.4

Note: Enrollment percentages are based on December 1st counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported.
Averages reported above exclude districts missing data for any of the three years. See Appendix B for more complete data.

Table 3

Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments
in Emotionally Disturbed Special Education Programs

District	1984-85 Percent	1985-86 Percent	1986-87 Percent
Atlanta	Unk	0.8	0.8
Baltimore	0.7	0.6	0.7
Chicago	0.6	0.7	0.6
Cleveland	Unk	0.6	0.7
Columbus	1.0	0.9	1.0
Dade County	0.5	Unk	Unk
Dallas	0.4	0.4	0.4
Denver	Unk	1.4	1.6
Fresno	Unk	0.3	0.2
Houston	Unk	0.3	0.4
Indianapolis	0.4	0.4	0.4
Long Beach	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Los Angeles	0.4	0.4	0.4
Memphis	Unk	0.3	0.4
Milwaukee	1.5	1.6	1.7
Minneapolis	Unk	2.8	2.5
Nashville	Unk	0.9	0.6
New York City	1.7	1.7	1.8
Norfolk	Unk	1.0	1.1
Omaha	Unk	2.3	2.0
Philadelphia	Unk	1.1	1.1
Phoenix	Unk	1.6	1.3
Pittsburgh	1.2	1.6	1.3
Rochester	Unk	2.6	2.6
San Francisco	0.7	0.5	0.4
Seattle	0.7	0.7	0.8
St. Paul	Unk	2.5	2.3
Tucson	Unk	0.8	0.8
Tulsa	Unk	0.2	0.2
Wake County	Unk	1.1	1.2
Washington, DC	0.8	0.9	0.8
Average	1.0	1.0	1.0

Note: Enrollment percentages are based on December 1st counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported.
Averages reported above exclude districts missing data for any of the three years. See Appendix B for more complete data.

Table 4

Annual Percentages of School District Enrollments in Learning Disability Special Education Programs

District	1984-85 Percent	1985-86 Percent	1986-87 Percent
Atlanta	Unk	1.6	1.6
Baltimore	9.2	8.5	8.8
Chicago	2.9	3.2	3.4
Cleveland	Unk	3.7	4.0
Columbus	3.9	3.9	4.0
Dade County	4.4	Unk	Unk
Dallas	3.4	3.2	2.8
Denver	Unk	3.8	4.4
Fresno	Unk	4.6	4.3
Houston	Unk	4.7	5.1
Indianapolis	4.8	4.8	4.5
Long Beach	3.5	3.3	3.5
Los Angeles	3.8	3.7	3.7
Memphis	Unk	3.3	3.4
Milwaukee	3.1	3.0	3.0
Minneapolis	Unk	5.5	5.8
Nashville	Unk	5.0	5.9
New York City	6.1	6.9	7.4
Norfolk	Unk	5.0	4.8
Omaha	Unk	4.5	4.1
Philadelphia	Unk	6.0	6.2
Phoenix	Unk	6.3	6.3
Pittsburgh	3.9	3.9	3.5
Rochester	Unk	5.9	5.8
San Francisco	6.3	5.6	5.5
Seattle	5.6	5.2	5.0
St. Paul	Unk	5.8	5.7
Tucson	Unk	5.1	4.7
Tulsa	Unk	6.8	7.1
Wake County	Unk	5.5	5.6
Washington, DC	3.5	3.5	3.9
Average	4.7	4.9	5.1

Note: Enrollment percentages are based on December 1st counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported.
Averages reported above exclude districts missing data for any of the three years. See Appendix B for more complete data.

disturbed, and learning disabled. (More detailed enrollment data are included in Appendix B.) Data also were collected on the per student costs for special and regular education for the same time period. Changes in the cost per student for both programs are summarized in Table 5. (Appendix C presents the individual district cost data.)

Student Enrollment

As indicated in the first table, there has not been a dramatic increase in student enrollments in special education programs. Over the three-year period, special education programs in the 33 CGCS districts averaged approximately 10.5 percent of total district student enrollments. There was a slight decrease between the 1984-85 and 1985-86 school years and a somewhat larger increase in special education enrollments in 1986-87. These data are slightly lower than the percentage reported by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), where approximately 11 percent of student enrollments nationwide were reported enrolled in special education programs as of October 1, 1987.

Special education enrollments in three of the largest handicapped classifications also were analyzed. Many special educators suspected that the number of students classified mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed or learning disabled was increasing, especially at the mildly handicapped end of the continuum. With increased attention and accountability being given to student achievement and at-risk students, special educators were concerned that some of their programs could become the depository for students who were not succeeding in school.

The data presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4 show that the numbers of students classified mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning

disabled have not increased significantly. There has been only a slight increase in the number of students classified mentally retarded (0.2 percent) and no change in the number of students classified emotionally disturbed. The largest gains were registered in the third classification, learning disabled (0.4 percent). These numbers point to fairly stable numbers of students enrolled in special education programs.

CGCS district percentages for the above three handicapped classifications were compared to national statistics reported by NASDSE (as of October 1, 1987). CGCS districts reported fewer students classified mentally retarded (1.38 versus 1.61 percent), almost equal numbers classified emotionally disturbed (1.00 versus .96 percent), and slightly more classified learning disabled (5.09 versus 4.80 percent). Although there were minor discrepancies between the CGCS and national enrollments in two of the handicapped categories, the overall special education enrollments of CGCS districts were lower than the national average reported by NASDSE.

Per Student Cost

The costs for special and regular education programs were the most difficult data to collect in this study. Problems arose because of differences among state and local funding formulas, fiscal years, and assignment and distribution of costs to program budget codes. Several different accounting methods were discussed and found unsatisfactory. As a last resort, the per student cost for special and regular education was finally chosen as the metric for analysis. This metric did not guarantee comparability in costs across school districts, but did permit comparisons in changes from year to year (providing the same formula was used in calculating costs) and between special and regular education within districts.

The increases reported in Table 5 reflect the percentage of change in the per student cost, using the previous year as the index for calculating change. For example, the Cleveland Public Schools reported that the cost per special education student increased 6.6 percent from 1985 to 1986 and 6.2 percent from 1986 to 1987, while the cost per regular education student increased 6.4 percent each year. (The actual cost data are included in Appendix C to this report.)

The expenditure increases varied greatly from one year to the next and from district to district. When increases occurred in tandem for both special and regular education, it can be assumed that these changes most likely represented fixed increases across all district programs (e.g., salary increases). When there were discrepancies between the increases reported for special and regular education, they were probably due to funding changes peculiar to one of the two programs rather than across the board increases.

The increases in per student cost were slightly higher (one to three percentage points) for special education programs than for regular education programs. However, given salary and other escalating costs, annual increases of ten percent or less for either program seem fairly conservative and stable. Contrary to the expectations of many school officials, these data do not attest to any uncontrolled upward spiraling of costs for special education. These data instead lend further support for the stability and accountability of special education programs.

Table 5

Annual Increase in Per Student Expenditures
for Special and Regular Education Programs

	Special Education		Regular Education	
District	1985-86 Increase	1986-87 Increase	1985-86 Increase	1986-87 Increase
Atlanta	8.9	Unk	13.0	Unk
Baltimore	4.4	3.3	6.8	26.1
Chicago	1.6	8.6	7.0	1.1
Cleveland	6.6	6.2	6.4	6.4
Columbus	14.9	4.0	9.2	4.0
Dallas	2.3	5.8	1.1	2.2
Fresno	11.4	6.5	9.4	9.2
Houston	7.9	(6.9)	2.4	6.6
Indianapolis	8.7	17.3	3.4	11.0
Long Beach	11.1	8.7	6.5	13.4
Los Angeles	9.2	13.9	8.8	9.2
Memphis	31.4	1.1	2.6	11.9
Milwaukee	8.7	8.7	8.7	11.9
Minneapolis	10.4	21.7	3.1	17.9
Nashville	Unk	(11.5)	5.5	6.3
New York City	9.9	9.2	8.4	8.1
Norfolk	11.1	32.6	14.2	10.6
Omaha	9.4	Unk	5.5	Unk
Philadelphia	1.9	9.2	15.0	2.5
Phoenix	0.8	Unk	4.2	Unk
Pittsburgh	1.6	13.5	5.3	6.6
Rochester	9.1	14.0	6.7	11.7
San Diego	2.6	10.8	7.1	9.8
San Francisco	28.7	8.8	9.9	4.3
Seattle	2.6	14.6	4.7	7.0
St. Paul	10.0	13.8	10.0	14.0
Tucson	14.8	3.7	16.5	4.7
Tulsa	25.8	14.6	3.4	5.7
Average	10.7	9.7	7.5	8.7

Note: Per student expenditures are based on costs associated with direct instruction, related services, and administration (for either special or regular education). Costs are not included for transportation, debt services, or capital improvements. The number of students is based on average daily membership for that particular school year. Percent increases are calculated on the increase per year per student, indexed by the previous year per student expenditure. Unk=unknown, not reported. Averages reported above exclude districts with data missing for any of the three years. See Appendix C for per student costs for special and regular education.

Referral and Placement in Special Education Programs

As noted in the initial report on the study in 1986 (Buttram, Kershner, & Rioux, 1986), "there is much speculation that referrals to and placements in special education programs are growing significantly." Unfortunately, many districts have decentralized the process for referring students to special education and so the number of referrals made to special education each year are difficult to retrieve. Of the 33 CGCS districts who participated in the present study, less than half (15 or 45.5 percent) were able to produce complete referral and placement data for the three years in question. Available numbers fluctuated greatly and so it was decided that there were insufficient data to reliably study any change in student referrals to special education. The originally planned analyses (to examine changes in the annual number of referrals to special education) thus were amended to study only the change in placement rates over the three years.

Table 6 presents the percent of students who were referred and then placed in special education programs during the study's three years. (Appendix D provides more complete data on referrals and subsequent placements in special education.) As a group, the 15 districts with complete data showed improvement in the percentage of students who were referred and subsequently placed in special education. These increases translate into significant savings for districts in that scarce resources were not spent testing students who were unlikely to qualify for special education programs. Given the average cost of testing a special education referral (estimated between $900 and $2000), reductions in inappropriate referrals by 10 percent add up quickly.

Table 6

Annual Percentage of Students
Who Were Referred and Then Placed
in Special Education Programs

District	1984-85	1985-86	1987-88
Baltimore	50.0	46.9	44.1
Chicago	46.2	77.0	80.0
Cleveland	43.9	100.0	100.0
Columbus	37.7	74.9	76.5
Dade County	52.5	Unk	Unk
Dallas	80.0	64.7	62.5
Denver	56.4	Unk	Unk
Houston	Unk	85.0	85.0
Indianapolis	47.1	65.6	72.0
Long Beach	48.1	85.0	85.0
Los Angeles	42.4	Unk	Unk
Memphis	91.7	79.9	80.0
Milwaukee	63.0	63.0	68.0
Minneapolis	Unk	40.4	36.4
Nashville	Unk	53.8	54.0
New Orleans	69.6	Unk	Unk
New York City	66.2	61.8	67.0
Norfolk	Unk	Unk	34.5
Omaha	75.0	96.2	96.2
Philadelphia	75.7	88.7	93.5
Phoenix	Unk	21.3	44.6
Pittsburgh	90.8	90.8	71.1
Rochester	7.8	61.9	52.4
San Francisco	64.7	Unk	Unk
Seattle	91.8	Unk	Unk
St. Paul	29.7	Unk	Unk
Tucson	Unk	32.0	27.4
Tulsa	46.1	15.2	10.8
Washington, DC	78.6	Unk	72.8
Average	57.5	65.5	68.6

Note: Percentages are based on June 30th counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported.
Averages reported above exclude districts with data missing for any of the the three years. See Appendix D for more complete data.

Many districts anecdotally reported that this reduction was accompanied by the institution of pre-referral procedures. These procedures provided for initial screening and/or classroom interventions in order to address students' difficulties prior to initiating more formal referrals. The latter were directed at organizing schools to provide regular education alternatives to meet the needs of at-risk students within their existing classrooms. These efforts have been extremely beneficial for both special and regular education.

There is an unresolved dilemma in assessing the referral and placement data: there is no real consensus on what percentage of referrals should result in special education placements. One extreme position argues that the two figures (i.e., referrals and placements) should be in close agreement. Since classroom teachers and other educators should be fairly accurate in identifying appropriate referrals, the majority of student referrals should result in special education placements. The opposing point of view asserts that it is not always possible to determine prior to testing whether a particular student is an appropriate candidate. In fact, the purpose of testing is to determine whether the placement is appropriate, and so it doesn't matter whether there is a close match or not. Regardless of which position is taken, it is clear that reducing the number of inappropriate referrals to special education preserves valuable resources. CGCS districts have taken steps to ensure that this happens.

Special Education Complaints and Hearings

In this second round of data gathering, information was gathered on the number of special education complaints, hearings, and the resolution of these hearings. Table 7 reports on the number of complaints and hearings in CGCS districts. (Appendix E presents additional information of special education complaints and hearings.)

Only five of the 33 CGCS districts faced significant numbers of complaints regarding the provision of special education services to handicapped students. Since three of the five are the largest districts in the country - (i.e., New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago), these high numbers were not unexpected. What was surprising was the relatively low number of complaints across the country. Over half of the 33 districts reported five or fewer complaints each year; this number seems especially noteworthy given the strong advocacy of parents of handicapped children.

Also surprising was the low number of complaints that ended in formal hearings. This low incidence points to the effectiveness of school district efforts to resolve differences prior to formal hearings. Although not reported in Table 7 below, it should be noted that school districts generally prevailed when complaints were not resolved prior to hearings (see Appendix E, Table E-1). In only two school districts did complainants prevail in relatively large numbers. These data lend further support for the accountability of special education programs in meeting the needs of handicapped students.

Table 7

Annual Number of Special Education Complaints
That Ended in Hearings

District	1984-85		1985-86		1986-87	
	Comp	Hear	Comp	Hear	Comp	Hear
Atlanta	2	0	5	2	14	4
Baltimore	150	39	110	44	124	26
Chicago	231	34	242	47	365	37
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	Unk	Unk
Columbus	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallas	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denver	0	0	0	0	2	0
Fresno	1	1	3	0	8	6
Houston	5	1	4	1	2	0
Indianapolis	0	0	0	0	2	1
Long Beach	2	2	2	0	4	1
Los Angeles	176	9	157	18	135	24
Memphis	4	1	4	1	7	0
Minneapolis	0	0	0	0	1	0
Nashville	Unk	2	4	2	26	1
New Orleans	3	1	3	1	1	1
New York City	861	400	903	412	860	394
Norfolk	1	1	1	1	1	1
Omaha	0	0	0	0	2	2
Philadelphia	Unk	Unk	59	33	85	40
Phoenix	1	0	0	0	0	0
Pittsburgh	2	2	3	1	4	2
Rochester	Unk	Unk	65	42	25	43
San Diego	21	0	27	0	31	0
San Francisco	5	0	32	2	32	7
Seattle	9	4	9	3	5	1
Tucson	0	0	0	0	1	0
Tulsa	12	2	15	2	15	2
Wake County	0	1	1	0	2	0
Washington, DC	292	118	231	117	155	80

Note: Comp-number of special education complaints.
Hear-number of hearings conducted in response to special education complaints.
Unk=unknown, not reported.
See Appendix E for more complete data.

Special Education Program Evaluation

A list of possible evaluation activities for special education programs was developed (based on effective indicators identified by the National RRC Panel, 1986, in conjunction with the Center for Resource Management). Special education directors were asked to indicate which activities their districts engaged in during 1985-86, 1986-87, or would like to in the future. Their responses are summarized in Table 8 below. (Complete listings of district responses are included in Appendix F.)

Table 8

Special Education Evaluation Activities

Evaluation Activity	1985-86		1986-87		Future	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Determine compliance	30	90.9	31	93.9	22	66.7
Evaluate adequacy of policies and procedures	24	72.7	26	78.6	24	72.7
Examine practice versus standards	21	63.6	23	69.7	22	66.7
Demonstrate efficient and effective use of resources	18	54.6	24	72.7	26	78.6
Conduct needs assessment	21	63.6	23	69.7	22	66.7
Identify program strengths and weaknesses	21	63.6	28	84.9	28	84.9
Determine comparative merit of program	12	36.4	12	36.4	23	69.7
Examine effectiveness regarding program outcomes	16	48.5	19	57.6	24	72.7
Examine effectiveness regarding student progress	14	42.4	19	57.6	29	87.9
Provide research-based support for program	8	24.2	11	33.3	27	81.8

Note: See Appendix F for more complete information.

Over 90 percent of the districts reported that they were engaged in evaluation activities to determine compliance with federal or state guidelines. Significant numbers also devoted program evaluation resources to ensure the adequacy of special education policies and procedures and other accountability-directed purposes. If federal and state regulations were lessened, approximately one-third of the districts would drop compliance evaluations. These types of evaluations provide little insight and direction in reshaping special education programs to better meet handicapped students' needs.

The directors' responses indicated a preference to devote more of their limited evaluation resources to improving the effectiveness of special education program services. Specifically, resources would be allocated to determining the comparative merit of programs or approaches, examining the effectiveness of particular approaches in achieving program outcomes and student progress, and investigating different strategies for meeting handicapped student needs. Evaluations directed at these purposes clearly would help to improve the effectiveness of special education programs.

Information on CGCS districts' use of evaluation criteria to assess student progress in special education programs also was gathered. These data are summarized in Table 9 below. (Appendix F also presents this information by individual district.)

The districts, as a group, did not seem to rely on any consistent set of criteria to monitor student progress. The most frequently cited criteron, "completion of high school", is probably only meaningful for mildly handicapped students. Over three-fourths of the districts expressed a desire to use another criterion, "return to the general education program", but this

criterion again has limited applicability. Approximately two-thirds of the CGCS districts were interested in using more growth-oriented criteria, including the development of academic competencies, vocational competencies, positive behaviors and attitudes, and self-help and independent living skills. These developmental criteria are in keeping with the desire to investigate the effectiveness of different strategies in meeting handicapped students' needs.

Table 9

Special Education Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	1985-86		1986-87		Future	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Attendance, graduation, dropout, and suspension rates	15	45.5	17	51.5	22	66.7
Return to general education program	9	27.3	13	39.4	26	78.6
Completion of high school	22	66.7	21	63.6	19	57.6
Appropriate progress by LEP students	5	15.2	8	24.2	15	45.5
Development of academic competencies	12	36.4	19	57.6	23	69.7
Development of vocational competencies	13	39.4	18	54.6	21	63.6
Development of positive behaviors and attitudes	12	36.4	15	45.5	20	60.6
Development of creative interests	3	9.1	4	12.1	11	33.3
Development of self-help and independent living skills	17	51.5	20	60.6	22	66.7

Note: See Appendix F for more complete information.

Integration of Special and Regular Education

Over the past three years, increasing attention has been given to the integration of special education programs for the mildly handicapped with regular education programs. This attention has come at the federal, state, and local levels. In fact, the initial CGCS special education study (Buttram, et al, 1986) recommended that this issue be more fully explored and resulted in a proposal for federal funds to support research in member districts. Although the proposal was unsuccessful, several of the CGCS districts have initiated attempts to integrate instructional programs for the mildly handicapped and other at-risk students independently.

In this second round of data collection, information was gathered on district efforts to integrate special education programs for mildly handicapped students with regular education programs. Data were collected on the assignment of special education students to either integrated (least restrictive environments-LRE) or segregated settings, as well as districts' participation in activities to integrate special and regular education staff and students. (These findings are summarized below and presented in more detail in Appendix G.)

Special Education School Settings

Table 10 presents information on the percentages of school buildings with only special programs, only regular programs, or both. Table 11 reports on the number of handicapped students assigned to segregated buildings and integrated settings (LRE). During the 1985-86 and 1986-87 school years, the vast majority of special education students were assigned to school buildings with both special and regular education programs. During both years, less than five percent of the school buildings were

reserved for either special education or regular education programs only. These data substantiate that most handicapped children are assigned to school buildings that serve a broad mix of students.

Table 10

Percent of School Buildings
With Special and/or Regular Education Programs

	1985-86			1986-87		
District	Only SpecEd Percent	Only RegEd Percent	Both Percent	Only SpecEd Percent	Only RegEd Percent	Both Percent
Atlanta	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Baltimore	7.9	0.0	92.1	6.6	0.0	94.0
Chicago	2.4	0.0	97.6	2.4	0.0	97.6
Cleveland	2.5	33.6	63.9	2.5	33.6	63.9
Columbus	2.3	0.0	97.7	2.3	0.0	97.7
Dade County	0.8	0.0	99.2	0.8	0.0	99.2
Dallas	2.2	0.0	97.8	2.2	0.0	97.8
Denver	0.9	0.0	99.1	0.9	0.0	99.1
Fresno	3.8	3.8	92.4	3.8	3.8	92.4
Houston	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Indianapolis	2.3	0.0	97.7	1.2	0.0	98.8
Long Beach	3.8	0.0	96.2	3.8	0.0	96.2
Memphis	4.4	0.0	95.6	4.4	0.0	95.6
Milwaukee	2.7	0.0	97.3	2.7	0.0	97.3
Minneapolis	5.0	0.0	95.0	4.9	0.0	95.1
Nashville	5.0	0.0	95.0	5.0	0.0	95.0
New Orleans	3.3	3.3	93.4	3.3	3.3	93.4
New York City	3.5	0.0	96.5	3.5	0.0	96.5
Norfolk	3.4	6.8	89.8	5.2	3.2	89.6
Omaha	1.3	0.0	98.7	2.5	0.0	97.5
Philadelphia	0.8	0.0	99.2	0.8	0.0	99.2
Phoenix	15.4	0.0	84.6	15.4	0.0	84.6
Pittsburgh	3.6	0.0	96.4	3.8	0.0	96.2
Rochester	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
San Diego	4.0	0.0	96.0	3.9	0.0	96.1
San Francisco	1.6	0.0	98.4	1.6	0.0	98.4
St. Paul	1.9	0.0	89.1	1.9	0.0	89.1
Tucson	3.1	0.0	96.9	3.1	0.0	96.9
Tulsa	0.0	2.2	97.8	0.0	1.1	98.9
Washington, DC	2.2	0.0	97.8	2.3	0.0	97.7
Average	2.8	1.5	95.7	2.8	1.3	95.9

Note: Building statistics are based on December 1st counts. See Appendix G for more complete information.

Table 11

Percent of Special Education Students
Placed in Segregated and LRE School Settings

District	1985-86 Segregated Percent	1985-86 LRE Percent	1986-87 Segregated Percent	1986-87 LRE Percent
Atlanta	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Baltimore	8.3	91.7	8.3	91.7
Chicago	3.9	96.1	4.3	95.8
Cleveland	4.9	95.1	4.6	95.4
Columbus	6.9	93.1	7.1	92.9
Dade County	0.8	99.2	0.8	99.2
Dallas	1.7	98.3	3.2	96.8
Denver	1.1	98.9	0.8	99.2
Fresno	4.3	95.7	4.1	95.9
Houston	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Indianapolis	4.9	95.1	3.3	96.7
Long Beach	9.7	90.3	9.1	90.9
Los Angeles	10.3	89.7	9.7	90.3
Memphis	4.4	95.6	4.4	95.6
Milwaukee	5.4	94.6	5.7	94.3
Minneapolis	9.7	90.3	9.5	90.5
Nashville	9.1	90.9	6.6	93.4
New York City	6.2	93.8	6.0	94.0
Norfolk	2.9	97.1	5.7	94.3
Omaha	1.3	98.7	1.7	98.3
Philadelphia	2.0	98.0	1.8	98.2
Phoenix	13.9	86.1	14.0	86.0
Pittsburgh	4.6	95.4	5.2	94.8
Rochester	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
San Francisco	1.9	98.1	2.1	97.9
St. Paul	6.0	94.0	6.4	93.6
Tucson	6.1	93.9	6.2	93.8
Tulsa	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Washington, DC	0.0	100.0	0.0	91.2
Average	5.0	95.0	5.1	94.9

Note: Enrollment percentages are based on December 1st counts.
Segregated-only special education students enrolled in school.
LRE-special and regular education students enrolled in school.
See Appendix G for more complete information.

Staff and Students

The CGCS Special Education Steering Committee identified a number of ways that special education staff and students can be integrated with regular education staff and students. Special education directors in all of the CGCS districts were then asked to indicate whether their districts engaged in these activities during the 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87 school years. Their responses are summarized in Tables 12 and 13 for staff and students respectively.

By the 1986-87 school year, almost four-fifths of the CGCS district special education programs were involved in providing assistance to regular education programs. Assistance was provided in a variety of ways -- by training regular education staff, providing technical assistance to regular education staff, and providing follow-up assistance when special education students returned to regular education classrooms. In addition, regular education staff routinely participated in interviews of special education candidates. However, fewer districts reported that regular education provided training to special education staff, included them in grade level groupings and activities, or located the special education department in the central office instructional division. These data suggest that special education programs have reached out to regular education programs to begin the integration process, but their efforts have not been reciprocated at the same intensity by regular education.

Table 12

Participation in Staff Integration Activities

Activity	1984-85 Number	1984-85 Percent	1985-86 Number	1985-86 Percent	1986-87 Number	1986-87 Percent
Ongoing planning between regular, compensatory, and special education	18	54.6	20	60.6	23	69.7
Special education train regular education	28	84.9	30	90.9	29	87.9
Regular education train special education	16	48.5	20	60.6	22	66.7
Special education provide technical assistance to regular education	28	84.9	31	93.9	32	97.0
Special education provide follow-up to regular education	24	72.7	25	75.8	26	78.8
Special education teachers assigned to grade level groupings	22	66.7	24	72.7	23	69.7
Special education department located in central office division	19	57.6	19	57.6	19	57.6
Administrators receive special education training	17	51.5	18	54.6	20	60.6
Special and regular education jointly interview candidates	24	72.7	27	81.8	27	81.8
Special education teachers work with special and regular education students	5	15.2	6	18.2	8	24.2

Note: See Appendix G for more detailed information.

Table 13

Participation in Student Integration Activities

Activity	1984-85		1985-86		1986-87	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Common referral system	28	84.9	28	84.9	30	90.1
Curriculum development involves special and regular education	19	57.6	23	69.7	26	78.6
Common tracking system	6	18.2	6	18.2	6	18.2
Learning consultants available to special and regular education	25	75.8	25	75.8	26	78.6
Common instructional materials	28	84.9	30	90.9	30	90.9
Extracurricular activities open to both	31	93.9	32	97.0	32	97.0
Regular education students serve as peer tutors for special education	18	54.6	22	66.7	23	69.7
Reverse mainstreaming used	7	21.2	8	24.2	9	27.3

Note: See Appendix G for more detailed information.

Districts also indicated their participation in activities to integrate special and regular education students. By the 1986-87 school year, over 90 percent of the CGCS districts indicated that a common system was used to refer students to special education and other programs and that district instructional materials and extracurricular activities were accessible to both special and regular education students. Fewer districts reported that the same system was used to track special and regular education student progress or that reverse mainstreaming was used.

Districts generally showed the same level of participation in activities to integrate special and regular education staff and students. As indicated in Table 14 below, school districts did not participate in proportionately more activities to integrate staff than to integrate students. Equal emphasis seemed to be placed on each.

Table 14

Average Number of Activities
To Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff and Students

Average Number of Practices

	1984-85		1985-86		1986-87	
Population	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Staff	6.1	61.0	6.7	67.0	7.0	70.0
Students	4.9	61.3	5.3	66.3	5.5	68.8

Note: See Appendix G for more detailed information.

Special Education Policy and Program Recommendations

The final theme addressed the future of special education programs in urban school districts. The CGCS Special Education Steering Committee identified ten policy-level recommendations for all CGCS districts to consider and rank in terms of their importance. The steering committee also identified ten programmatic needs and again asked member districts to rank them in terms of importance. These rankings are presented in Tables 15 and 16 respectively. (Appendix H reports on these rankings in more detail.)

Table 15

Rankings of Special Education Policy-Level Recommendations

Recommendation	Ranking
Explore options for integrating regular, compensatory, and special education programs	1
Increase funds to match federal-state program mandates	2
Train regular education administrators and classroom teachers in special education programs and practices	3
Increase opportunities for transitional programs, including from home to school and school to adult	4
Investigate the impact of extended year programs on special education student progress	5
Modify special education referral, evaluation, and placement process	6
Increase flexibility for program spending	7.5
Disseminate program practices	7.5
Clarify or revise handicapped classifications	9
Investigate the impact of state testing and graduation requirements on special education students	10

Note: Rankings range from 1 (most important) to 10 (least important). See Appendix H for more details.

In terms of policy-level recommendations, CGCS special education directors ranked as most important the exploration of options for integrating regular, compensatory, and special education programs. The third highest ranked recommendation called for the training of regular education administrators and classroom teachers in special education programs and practices. The commitment of special education to the integration of special and regular education is once again demonstrated by these high rankings.

Given the financial restraints present in most school districts, the second highest ranked recommendation called for an increase in funds to match federal and/or state special education program mandates. Special education directors noted their continued frustration with program mandates by federal and state governments without the provision of funds to support these mandates.

Table 16 summarizes the special education directors' rankings of programmatic needs. The most critical need in CGCS districts centered on programs for the severely emotionally disturbed students. This has been an issue consistently raised in directors' formal and informal discussions.

Not surprising, the second highest ranked need called for programs to integrate mildly handicapped and regular education students. Other highly ranked needs were in the areas of preschool and vocational programs for handicapped students.

Special education directors also were asked if their districts could provide assistance to other CGCS districts in the ten programmatic need areas. Appendix H provides a list of districts who volunteered to provide assistance to others in the ten programmatic need areas.

Table 16

Rankings of Special Education Programmatic Needs

Programmatic Need	Ranking
Programs for severely emotionally, disturbed students	1
Integration programs for mildly handicapped and regular education students	2
Preschool programs for special education students	3
Vocational programs for special education students	4
Development of core curriculum for special education students	5
Transition services (including home to school and school to adult)	6.5
Evaluation of special education student progress	6.5
Programs for bilingual, special education students	8
Over-representation of minority students in special education programs	9
Interagency collaboration to provide services to special education students	10

Note: Rankings range from 1 (most important) to 10 (least important). See Appendix H for more details.

III. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter of the report summarizes the major findings of the study and presents recommendations for the consideration of school board members, superintendents, special educators, and other policymakers. The findings and recommendations together are intended to inform, stimulate, and challenge special education decisionmakers.

Study Findings

The CGCS three-year special education study has produced invaluable data on the current status of special education in urban districts. The results sometimes confirmed perceptions about the management and operations of special education programs. However, the results also refuted some popular perceptions about special education held by legislators, school board members, superintendents, and even special educators, especially regarding student enrollments in special education programs and the per student cost for special education programs. The findings are summarized below.

Stability of Special Education Enrollments and Costs

Data gathered for the 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87 school years showed little increase in the number of students enrolled in special education programs overall as well as in three of the larger classifications -- mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled. Special education enrollments hovered around 10.5 percent of district enrollments during these three years; no overall dramatic increases were found. These findings are contrary to widely held perceptions that student enrollments in special education have been increasing dramatically.

Per student costs for special and regular education also were examined for the same three years. Although the per student cost for special education increased each year, the cost also rose for regular education. The increases were slightly higher for special education than for regular education -- by 1 to 3 percentage points. Contrary to expectations, the data did not point to any uncontrolled upward spiraling of costs related to special education.

Referral and Placement of Students in Special Education Programs

The percentage of students referred and then placed in special education programs was collected for each year. The number of districts who reported complete data was smaller than expected; less than half routinely collected these data in a central location. Nevertheless, the results showed that many districts have made substantial progress in reducing the number of inappropriate referrals, often by instituting some type of pre-referral procedure. Given the costs of testing, even these modest reductions in the number of inappropriate referrals (3 to 8 percent overall) quickly translate into sizable savings and indicate that special education programs improving the accountability of the referral process.

Special Education Complaints and Hearings

Data collected on the number of special education complaints and hearings indicated that these do not represent a major problem to most districts. Only five cities reported significant numbers of complaints, and three of the five are the largest school districts in the country. Most of the complaints were settled prior to formal hearings and when hearings did occur, school districts generally prevailed.

Evaluation of Special Education Programs

Special education directors were asked to report on district special education evaluation activities and their use of different evaluation criteria. Their responses indicated that most of the special education evaluation resources were devoted to ensuring that district programs comply with federal and state regulations and that required procedures are followed. If these requirements were lessened, directors reported that more of their evaluation resources would be devoted to identifying and determining the effectiveness of different strategies in meeting handicapped students' needs.

They also were asked to indicate evaluation criteria they currently use and would like to use in the future to assess student progress. Criteria currently used center around "return to general education" or "graduate from high school", but these criteria were only suitable for a small proportion of the handicapped student population. The directors expressed interest in looking at more growth-oriented criteria such as the development of academic, vocational, and self-help competencies. However, research first must be completed on the development of effective indicators in these areas before they can be used to assess handicapped student progress. These indicators will be especially important as districts move away from compliance-directed evaluations.

Integration of Special and Regular Education Programs

Information on the integration of special and regular education programs was gathered from a number of different perspectives. The results indicated that most special education students were enrolled in school buildings with both special and regular education programs. Few handicapped students were

assigned to programs in segregated settings.

In terms of other measures of student integration, the results indicated that most districts used a common referral system to identify students that require additional help -- from either special education or other district programs. Instructional materials were shared by special education and regular education and extracurricular activities were open to both groups of students. However, special education and regular education did not use the same student progress reporting system.

Special education programs have consistently reached out to regular education and their staffs. Special education staff have provided training, technical assistance, and follow-up to regular education staff. Regular education staff have routinely participated in interviews of special education candidates. In contrast, regular education less often provided training to special education staff, included special education staff in grade level or department groupings, or located the special education department in the central office instructional division. These results suggest that special education attempts to integrate special and regular education programs have not been fully reciprocated by regular education.

Policy and Program Recommendations

Special education directors were asked to rank ten policy recommendations for special education programs. In general, recommendations concerning the integration of special and regular education and increased funding for special education programs were ranked highest. Special education directors also were asked to rank ten programmatic needs. Highest on their list were programs for the severely emotionally disturbed students and integration programs for mildly handicapped and regular education

students. Other highly ranked needs were in the areas of preschool and vocational programs. These responses lend further support to the importance given by special educators to the integration of special and regular education.

Recommendations

Four recommendations are presented for the consideration of CGCS school board members, superintendents, special educators, and other policymakers. These recommendations are based on the findings summarized above. They are listed and discussed below.

1. Continue exploring options for integrating special education programs for the mildly handicapped with regular education programs, giving particular emphasis to involving regular education actively.

The study findings affirm the importance and support given by special educators to the integration of special education programs for mildly handicapped students with regular education programs. The data further suggest that these efforts, to date, have not been reciprocated by regular education at the same intensity. To be successful, future efforts must include regular education staff from the initial planning to the actual implementation. However, this is not enough to ensure success. Regular education staff must believe that the integration of these two programs is in their best interest. Thus, special educators, with the help of school boards, superintendents, and other key decisionmakers must begin to pull regular education staff into discussions about program integration and convince them that integration efforts will benefit both special and regular education programs and students. Until regular education staff see the

importance, integration efforts will continue to be one-sided and unlikely to produce significant effects.

2. Provide for centralized recordkeeping so that special education directors can monitor and manage their program operations effectively.

In collecting the data for both phases of this study, it often was surprising how much information was not available to special education directors and their staffs. Many reported that records for their programs, or key components, have been decentralized and so access to information is difficult. For example, over half of the districts did not have information on the number of referrals to special education each year. Others had great difficulty obtaining budget information on the costs of their programs. Many special education programs are being held accountable for managing and overseeing these and other areas without access to necessary information. District specialists in management information systems and accounting should work closely with special education directors to ensure their access to information necessary to the effective and efficient management of their programs.

3. Expand special education evaluation activities to assess handicapped student progress.

One of the precipitating concerns for the CGCS's examination of special education programs was the perceived lack of any measure of student achievement or progress. Both rounds of data collection confirmed the lack of achievement data on handicapped students. However, the results of the second round of data collection suggest that special education programs are eager to collect such data. Unfortunately, it is not a simple matter of making a commitment to collect data on handicapped student progress.

Research is needed to develop, field test, and validate appropriate indicators and measures. Special educators and other school officials must begin to call attention to this need and insist that the necessary development be completed.

4. Increase communication between special educators in school districts and federal policymakers so that research priorities reflect special education needs.

A number of issues have been identified that are critical to the future of special education programs, from the development of measures to assess handicapped student progress to the need for programs for severely emotionally disturbed students. The federal government each year allocates research dollars to investigate various special education issues. School district special educators and other school officials need to communicate their priorities more effectively and work closely with federal policymakers to make sure that federal dollars are given to support these priorities.

REFERENCES

Buttram, J.L., Kershner, K.M., & Rioux, S. A Study of Special Education: Views from America's Cities. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, 1986.

The National RRC Panel on Indicators of Effectiveness in Special Education. Effectiveness Indicators for Special Education: A Reference Tool. Hampton, NH: Center for Resource Management, 1986.

SPECIAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA'S CITIES:
A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

APPENDIX

A. Study Methodology
B. Student Enrollments
C. Fiscal Data
D. Referral and Placement Data
E. Complaint and Hearing Data
F. Evaluation Activities
G. Integration with Regular Education
H. Recommendations
I. Staff Data
J. Student Exit Data
K. Vocational Education Data

The Council of the Great City Schools
and
Research for Better Schools

1982

APPENDIX A

STUDY METHODOLOGY

STUDY METHODOLOGY

Urban school districts have become increasingly concerned about the mission, roles, and effectiveness of special education programs. Special education changed radically in the mid-1970s with the passage of P.L. 94-142, other federal and state legislation, and related court decisions. In response, school districts focused their attention on identifying handicapped students, diagnosing their handicaps, and placing them in special education programs. As school districts began to succeed with these tasks, their focus expanded to include post-placement, programmatic activities. That is, what instruction, class size, curricula, and intervention might best remediate or minimize the handicapping condition. Recently, this focus has expanded to include the appropriateness of special education referrals, the cost of special education programs, and data school districts gather about handicapped students, their needs, and the effectiveness of these services.

In 1985, the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) authorized an examination of special education programs in their districts. Research for Better Schools (RBS) agreed to collaborate with the Council in designing and carrying out the study. This study was conducted in two phases. Phase 1 of the study concentrated on collecting data that was responsive to the CGCS board of directors; these data focused on special education programs during the 1984-85 school year. Based on the results of the first year effort, the special education directors of the CGCS districts decided to extend the study to collect data on two more school years (1985-86 and 1986-87). This additional data collection

provided for a longitudinal analysis of trends in special education programs.

Phase 1 of Study

Phase 1 of the special education study began in the spring of 1985 with a meeting in Philadelphia of the CGCS special education and research directors and RBS staff to discuss the study concept and focus. The meeting produced an agreement to proceed with the study and an outline to guide further planning.

During the summer, CGCS members formulated the following study questions.

- How are special education programs organized, developed, and managed?
- What do the services cost?
- What are the characteristics of students classified for special education?
- How do students get placed in special education programs?
- What are the staffing and facility patterns?
- What services do these students receive?
- What impact do these services have?
- How are special education students involved in vocational programs and compensatory programs?
- What are the high priority special education issues facing local school districts?
- What are the most promising programs and practices presently in use?
- What recommendations should be made to state and federal policy makers with regard to special education?

These questions provided the framework for the design of the study, the initial survey instrument, the data analysis plan, and interpretation of

results. The study sample, survey instrument, data collection, analysis, and reporting for the first phase is described in greater detail below.

Phase 1 Sample

The special education directors of all 35 CGCS districts (membership as of December 1, 1985) were sent a survey and cover letter inviting them to participate in the study. Thirty-three districts (94.3 percent) participated by returning the initial survey. These districts are listed alphabetically below. The student populations ranged in size from 30,346 (St. Paul) to 932,880 (New York City) with a median of 63,346 (Nashville).

Albuquerque	Detroit	Philadelphia
Atlanta	Indianapolis	Pittsburgh
Baltimore	Long Beach	Portland
Boston	Los Angeles	Rochester
Buffalo	Memphis	St. Louis
Chicago	Milwaukee	St. Paul
Cleveland	Minneapolis	San Francisco
Columbus	Nashville	Seattle
Dade County	New Orleans	Toledo
Dallas	New York City	Tulsa
Denver	Omaha	Washington, D.C.

Phase 1 Survey Instrument

An initial draft of the survey was developed by the CGCS study directors and RBS staff to collect information relevant to the 11 study questions identified above. The initial draft contained specific questions within 17 information categories included in the study. These categories of questions were discussed with CGCS special education and research directors at their meeting in Pittsburgh in September 1985. By a voting procedure based on perceived priority, the group eliminated nine of the 17 categories. The remaining eight were students; staff and facilities; fiscal and budget;

pre-referral, referral, placement, and exit; program evaluation; vocational education; related services; and remedial and compensatory programs.

In October 1985, more specific survey question specifications were developed in the remaining categories and sent to all CGCS special education and research directors for review. The questions asked for information to be submitted via copies of existing reports and materials (e.g., P.L. 94-142 report to the SEA) and original information (e.g., number of referrals). Although many questions requested statistical information, others were open-ended requests for narrative information about procedures, results, or recommendations. Approximately half of the CGCS districts responded with suggestions for modifying the draft questions.

During December 1985, RBS staff field tested a draft survey form with special education and research staff in Philadelphia. Final revisions were made following the field test. The final form collected information on all of the above eight categories using existing and new information in statistical and narrative formats.

Phase 1 Data Collection

The survey was sent to all 35 CGCS members in January 1986 with a requested return date of February 21, 1986. As noted above, 33 cities eventually returned completed surveys to RBS. Survey responses were reviewed by RBS to ensure their accuracy and completeness. In many cases, RBS contacted school districts to check and confirm responses in order to produce a relatively clean data base.

Once the survey responses were verified, the information was organized into tabular listings for each survey question. These listings presented

data for each question by individual district. For example, one listing reported number of students by handicapping classifications by district. Narrative responses to survey questions were simply transcribed verbatim. This process resulted in 19 statistical and 23 narrative listings.

Both the statistical and narrative listings were shared with the CGCS study directors and a group of 12 special education directors in mid-June of 1986. This group reviewed and reduced the number and focus of the statistical and narrative listings. Reductions occurred when large numbers of the districts were unable to produce information (e.g., special education student involvement in remedial and compensatory education programs) or information reported by districts was judged unreliable or inconsistent across districts (e.g., staffing patterns). Although some revisions were made in the range of information collected on a particular category, only two were completely eliminated -- special education staffing patterns and remedial and compensatory education.

Based on the feedback of the special education directors, a total of 11 statistical and 15 narrative listings were returned to allow the 33 participating districts to verify the accuracy of the revised data base and to update and focus their responses to the narrative items. These materials were sent to districts in mid-July with an expected one month turnaround.

Updated responses were returned by 21 of the 33 districts (64 percent). An additional seven districts were contacted by telephone by RBS to clarify and update information. The original survey responses were used for the five districts that elected not to return the updated survey items or to respond to telephone inquiries.

Phase 1 Data Analysis

The condensed statistical and narrative listings served as the data base for all of the data analyses. Simple descriptive statistics (e.g., means, medians, standard deviations, ranges) were calculated for the quantitative data listings. Categories were developed for coding each district's narrative responses. Frequency counts and percentages were calculated for the coded narrative responses.

These analyses were reviewed by the study directors and a subgroup of six of the special education directors that reviewed the statistical and narrative listings in June. During this second meeting, the group again reviewed the accuracy and completeness of the data sets and identified underlying themes or issues supported by the data and their implications for special education overall and future research efforts. These themes were used to organize the study findings.

Phase 1 Reporting

As noted above, the Phase 1 findings were organized into seven themes. These themes also were used to organize the initial study report (Buttram, Kershner, & Rioux, 1986). This report was presented to the CGCS Board of Directors in the Fall of 1986. The presentation of the report satisfied the initial CGCS Board of Director's request for an examination of special education programs in urban school districts. However, the special education directors felt that the study left many of their questions unanswered because of the absence of any longitudinal or trend data. They decided to extend the study for a second round of data collection (Phase 2). This extension afforded them the opportunity to explore in more detail the

unresolved issues from the first phase and gather additional information on many emerging issues.

Phase 2 of the Study

The CGCS special education steering committee met in June of 1987 to discuss possible next steps to follow up on the report presented to the CGCS Board of Directors. At this meeting, they decided to pursue a second round of data collection in order to answer questions raised during the first phase of the study. The second phase of the study was aimed at collecting longitudinal information to answer the following questions.

- What are the percentage of district students enrolled in special education programs? by classification?
- What are the staffing and facility patterns?
- What are the per student costs for special and regular education?
- What are the pre-referral, referral, placement, and exit patterns from special education programs?
- In what types of activities do districts participate to integrate special education and regular education staff and students?
- What are the percentage of special and regular education students enrolled in vocational education?
- In what types of evaluation activities do districts participate?
- What are the policy recommendations for special education programs?

The intent was to gather longitudinal information to permit the analysis of trends in special education programs in these areas. The first phase of the study collected data on only one school year and so it was impossible to make any judgments about the changing status of special education programs.

Phase 2 Sample

The special education directors of all 40 districts (membership as of September 1, 1987) were sent a survey and cover letter inviting them to participate in the study. Thirty-three districts (82.5 percent) participated by returning the initial survey. These districts are listed alphabetically below. The 1986-87 student populations ranged in size from 19,703 (Phoenix) to 940,208 (New York City) with a median of 65,174 (San Francisco).

Atlanta	Long Beach	Phoenix
Baltimore	Los Angeles	Pittsburgh
Chicago	Memphis	Rochester
Cleveland	Milwaukee	San Diego
Columbus	Minneapolis	San Francisco
Dade County	Nashville	Seattle
Dallas	New Orleans	St. Paul
Denver	New York City	Tucson
Fresno	Norfolk	Tulsa
Houston	Omaha	Wake County
Indianapolis	Philadelphia	Washington, D.C.

Phase 2 Survey Instrument

RBS revised the original survey (used in Phase 1), by making changes in the specific items based on the results of the first effort and adding items to pick up additional information. The initial draft of the revised survey contained specific questions within 12 information categories included in the Phase 2 questions listed above.

The revised survey was reviewed by the CGCS special education steering committee and other special education directors present at the 1987 annual fall meeting. Several additions were suggested by the special education directors, including the collection of information on the number of special education-related hearings and complaints, the delineation of possible

district activities to integrate special and regular education staff, the use of specific evaluation criteria, and the identification of special education programmatic needs. These were incorporated in the final Phase 2 survey draft prepared by RBS. Unlike the Phase 1 instrument, the Phase 2 survey requested only statistical information. No open-ended, narrative response items were included.

Phase 2 Data Collection

The survey was sent to all 40 CGCS members in October 1987 with a requested return date of November 13, 1987. As noted above, 33 cities eventually returned completed surveys to RBS. Survey responses were reviewed by RBS to ensure their accuracy and completeness. In some cases, RBS contacted school districts to check and confirm responses in order to produce a relatively clean data base.

As in Phase 1, the information was organized into tabular listings for each survey item. These listings presented data for each item by individual district. This process resulted in 63 statistical listings. These were shared with the CGCS special education steering directors in mid-January of 1988. This group reviewed and reduced the number and focus of the statistical listings. Reductions occurred when large numbers of the districts were unable to produce information (e.g., number of referrals to special education) or information reported by districts was judged unreliable or inconsistent across districts (e.g., vocational program enrollments). A total of 55 statistical listings remained.

The 55 statistical listings were sent to all of the districts who responded to the initial Phase 2 survey. They were asked to review the

results and send any corrections to RBS. Eight (24.2 percent) responded with corrections. The original survey responses were used for the remaining districts.

Phase 2 Data Analysis and Reporting

The condensed statistical listings served as the data base for all of the data analyses. As with the Phase 1 analyses, simple descriptive statistics were calculated for the data listings. These analyses were reviewed by the CGCS special education steering committee in a meeting in Philadelphia in late August 1988. The group again reviewed the accuracy and completeness of the data sets. They also helped to identify underlying themes or issues supported by the data and their implications for special education. These themes were used to organize the study's findings as presented in the main body of this report.

APPENDIX B

STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

Table B-1

Annual Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21)

District	1984-85			1985-86			1986-87		
	Sp. Ed.	Dist.	%	Sp. Ed.	Dist.	%	Sp. Ed.	Dist.	%
Atlanta	Unk	Unk	Unk	4454	66570	6.7	3868	68988	5.6
Baltimore	18222	112000	16.3	17514	111894	15.7	17771	111179	16.0
Chicago	32997	428038	7.7	47275	429915	11.0	48164	430497	11.2
Cleveland	5724	74171	7.7	7885	77866	10.1	7914	73272	10.8
Columbus	6787	67661	10.0	6789	66823	10.2	6766	66158	10.2
Dade County	21815	228062	9.6	24000	234364	10.2	25000	Unk	Unk
Dallas	9011	130416	6.9	9006	127348	7.1	8973	131440	6.8
Denver	4811	57727	8.3	4472	59605	7.5	5070	60282	8.4
Fresno	Unk	Unk	Unk	4686	55857	8.4	5217	60733	8.6
Houston	Unk	Unk	Unk	15169	193889	7.8	17166	194567	8.8
Indianapolis	7383	53764	13.8	6859	52047	13.2	6302	50628	12.4
Long Beach	4051	61940	6.5	4093	63698	6.4	4165	65072	6.4
Los Angeles	46492	560264	8.3	45302	578760	7.8	46738	590287	7.9
Memphis	12114	104935	11.5	10101	106879	9.5	10066	107019	9.4
Milwaukee	8987	92533	9.7	8750	91195	9.6	8828	91081	9.7
Minneapolis	4859	37456	13.0	4909	38994	12.6	4896	38872	12.6
Nashville	5839	63346	9.2	6279	63346	9.9	7775	65076	11.9
New Orleans	9270	81393	11.4	6758	83876	8.1	6219	83716	7.4
New York City	110671	932880	11.9	111303	937313	11.9	106674	940208	11.3
Norfolk	Unk	Unk	Unk	4345	38688	11.2	4021	39900	10.1
Omaha	5600	41632	13.5	5590	40927	13.7	5342	40920	13.1
Philadelphia	24989	197980	12.6	22779	201053	11.3	23269	200370	11.6
Phoenix	Unk	Unk	Unk	2138	19417	11.0	2114	19703	10.7
Pittsburgh	5956	40257	14.8	6416	39601	16.2	5233	39141	13.4
Rochester	4686	32830	14.3	4739	32348	14.7	4729	32224	14.7
San Diego	Unk	Unk	Unk	11012	112952	9.7	11012	115148	9.6
San Francisco	6012	62979	9.5	5837	64734	9.0	5435	65174	8.3
Seattle	4342	41383	10.5	4261	43361	9.8	4300	43056	10.0
St. Paul	4715	30972	15.2	4706	31670	14.9	4825	32332	14.9
Tucson	Unk	Unk	Unk	5119	53331	9.6	4983	54286	9.2
Tulsa	5684	44691	12.7	5761	44521	12.9	5608	43985	12.7
Wake County	Unk	Unk	Unk	5509	57268	9.6	5732	58211	9.8
Washington, DC	6402	87927	7.3	7069	87677	8.1	7114	86893	8.2
Average	19096	146689	10.3	13360	130539	10.2	13372	124255	10.8

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts. Averages reported above exclude missing data.
Unk - unknown, not reported.

Table B-2

Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21)
in District Versus Contract-Operated Programs

	1985-86				1986-87			
	District		Contract		District		Contract	
District	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Atlanta	4454	96.8	149	3.2	3868	97.0	119	3.0
Baltimore	17514	96.4	663	3.6	17771	96.3	680	3.7
Chicago	47275	93.3	3421	6.7	48164	93.2	3520	6.8
Cleveland	7885	98.1	150	1.9	7914	98.1	150	1.9
Columbus	6789	95.3	333	4.7	6766	94.7	382	5.3
Dallas	9006	99.4	51	0.6	8973	99.4	52	0.6
Denver	4472	95.6	204	4.4	5070	96.3	194	3.7
Fresno	4686	94.5	272	5.5	5217	94.6	298	5.4
Houston	15169	99.1	135	0.9	17166	99.3	122	0.7
Indianapolis	6859	99.9	2	<0.1	6302	99.9	2	<0.1
Long Beach	4093	99.6	17	0.4	4165	99.7	14	0.3
Los Angeles	45302	97.4	1190	2.6	46738	97.1	1395	2.9
Memphis	10101	100.0	0	0.0	10066	99.9	2	<0.1
Milwaukee	8750	99.9	2	<0.1	8828	99.9	5	<0.1
Minneapolis	4909	94.6	282	5.4	4896	95.9	210	4.1
Nashville	6279	97.7	147	2.3	7775	97.4	205	2.6
New Orleans	6758	99.6	29	0.4	6219	99.7	20	0.3
New York City	111303	97.9	2377	2.1	106674	98.1	2105	1.9
Norfolk	4345	98.5	68	1.5	4021	97.7	95	2.3
Omaha	5590	97.1	170	2.9	5342	97.2	155	2.8
Philadelphia	22779	95.8	1007	4.2	23269	96.1	954	3.9
Phoenix	2138	98.6	30	1.4	2114	98.6	31	1.4
Pittsburgh	6416	95.8	283	4.2	5233	94.9	281	5.1
Rochester	4739	94.1	295	5.9	4729	93.9	305	6.1
San Diego	11012	98.2	203	1.8	11012	97.9	232	2.1
San Francisco	5837	95.0	308	5.0	5435	94.2	337	5.8
Seattle	4261	96.7	144	3.3	4300	96.8	142	3.2
St. Paul	4706	100.0	0	0.0	4825	100.0	0	0.0
Tucson	5119	99.8	13	0.2	4983	99.7	16	0.3
Tulsa	5761	100.0	0	0.0	5608	100.0	0	0.0
Wake County	5509	99.1	48	0.9	5732	99.2	49	0.8
Washington, DC	7069	91.2	683	8.8	7114	91.9	629	8.1
Average	13028	97.1	396	2.9	13009	97.0	397	3.0

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts. District-operated programs are managed by the school district, contract-operated programs are managed by agencies other than the school district.

Table B-3

Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21)
by Handicap in 1984-85

District	MR	Deaf	Speech	Visual	Emot.	Ortho	Health	LD	D/B	Multi	Other	Total
Baltimore	1510	136	5360	125	735	62	87	10282	2	619	0	18918
Chicago	7712	434	7149	125	2742	459	103	12482	0	0	1791	32997
Columbus	1954	142	1026	71	655	283	0	2607	0	49	0	6787
Dade County	2132	280	4000	113	1115	550	250	10131	0	250	2982	21803
Dallas	1152	85	2074	54	508	90	277	4401	13	698	22	9374
Indianapolis	2554	39	1720	20	223	52	0	2588	0	129	58	7383
Long Beach	281	57	1110	36	40	202	99	2190	0	36	0	4051
Los Angeles	4712	1746	8103	444	2136	1623	5751	21266	14	697	0	46492
Milwaukee	1451	134	2245	37	1430	178	66	2870	5	93	478	8987
New York City	8010	1452	3908	649	16074	607	17197	57154	13	2089	374	107527
Pittsburgh	1138	94	2324	88	474	48	0	1576	0	0	0	5742
San Francisco	579	88	944	21	442	124	45	3969	1	218	0	5406
Seattle	573	68	634	18	303	71	86	2308	3	105	0	4169
Washington, DC	1374	67	1786	32	741	74	91	3106	35	86	0	7392

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts.

Table B-4

Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21)
by Handicap in 1985-86

District	MR	Deaf	Speech	Visual	Emot.	Ortho	Health	LD	D/B	Multi	Other	Total
Atlanta	1049	4	862	28	551	32	22	1077	0	831	0	4454
Baltimore	1548	121	5106	83	719	53	99	9488	0	521	0	17738
Chicago	8233	676	8162	146	2819	560	250	13950	0	0	0	34796
Cleveland	2565	133	1686	126	499	261	0	2849	2	132	0	8252
Columbus	1889	141	1139	74	630	281	0	2582	0	53	0	6789
Dallas	1189	75	2265	40	484	105	0	4013	9	608	28	9057
Denver	671	99	525	42	810	67	0	2246	1	11	0	4472
Fresno	10	173	1487	11	176	233	8	2572	0	8	0	4678
Houston	2045	26	2511	68	650	345	0	9050	0	222	24	15169
Indianapolis	2279	28	1621	12	207	54	13	2517	1	81	46	6859
Long Beach	292	59	1287	29	35	169	76	2107	1	37	0	4092
Los Angeles	4712	1738	8103	421	2136	1622	5751	21262	14	697	0	46456
Memphis	2803	211	1938	103	356	92	64	3561	8	339	626	10101
Milwaukee	1464	133	2478	43	1477	212	77	2753	4	109	0	8750
Minneapolis	587	70	974	20	1084	7	26	2135	0	89	26	5018
Nashville	1331	188	1341	70	549	128	154	3193	0	118	0	7861
New York City	7681	862	5080	454	16402	417	5838	64874	0	2125	505	104238
Norfolk	667	33	892	4	404	19	10	1952	0	105	223	4314
Omaha	1228	120	1085	47	960	316	0	1834	0	0	0	5590
Philadelphia	3940	268	3959	138	2190	265	0	12020	0	0	0	22780
Phoenix	459	38	17	7	306	6	25	1231	0	47	0	2136
Pittsburgh	1039	85	2776	103	630	47	0	1556	4	0	0	6240
Rochester	881	91	919	11	835	70	1	1902	0	54	2	4766
San Francisco	483	93	13	31	348	90	3	3644	5	137	0	4847
Seattle	580	62	580	21	320	71	72	2247	2	101	0	4056
St. Paul	1043	103	1030	27	799	108	15	1849	0	0	19	4893
Tucson	485	122	1141	18	413	74	34	2720	0	112	0	5119
Tulsa	1059	85	1147	17	75	39	6	3044	7	109	0	5761
Wake County	1035	88	490	31	639	32	3	3124	0	21	36	5498
Washington, DC	1385	42	1526	26	792	65	96	3044	31	62	0	7069

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts.

Table B-5

Special Education Enrollments (Ages 3-21)
by Handicap in 1986-87

District	MR	Deaf	Speech	Visual	Emot.	Ortho	Health	LD	D/B	Multi	Other	Total
Atlanta	1406	46	713	25	577	42	2	1074	0	531	0	4416
Baltimore	1607	162	5346	107	771	69	115	9757	0	512	0	18446
Chicago	7239	753	7689	145	2698	596	250	14469	0	0	0	33839
Cleveland	2573	144	1586	128	510	266	0	2927	1	134	0	8269
Columbus	1810	138	1115	67	687	279	0	2614	0	56	0	6766
Dallas	1300	15	2470	52	529	115	298	3644	10	559	33	9025
Denver	684	87	553	39	949	80	0	2648	1	29	0	5070
Fresno	411	172	1514	30	137	255	21	2615	2	27	0	5184
Houston	2416	30	2852	82	869	388	278	9986	0	235	30	17166
Indianapolis	1916	32	1626	26	204	79	18	2268	1	52	80	6302
Long Beach	298	63	1221	28	30	165	70	2251	0	36	0	4162
Los Angeles	5072	1811	8299	346	2387	1715	5695	21905	16	751	0	47999
Memphis	2739	181	1874	105	382	169	43	3658	12	310	593	10066
Milwaukee	1528	142	2363	52	1565	339	77	2761	1	0	0	8828
Minneapolis	598	103	978	26	972	34	49	2252	0	90	24	5126
Nashville	1434	199	1519	80	408	188	172	3819	0	101	0	8495
New York City	7278	844	6065	412	17035	298	333	69584	0	1952	602	104403
Norfolk	611	86	596	21	424	14	17	1901	0	59	264	3993
Omaha	1208	126	1149	52	811	314	0	1682	0	0	0	5342
Philadelphia	3845	260	3987	130	2290	234	0	12523	0	0	0	23269
Phoenix	450	37	18	6	251	4	29	1238	0	82	0	2115
Pittsburgh	922	75	2033	89	512	53	0	1382	0	0	0	5062
Rochester	809	67	1067	13	842	40	3	1856	0	51	3	4751
San Francisco	378	79	11	15	254	85	36	3561	1	134	0	4554
Seattle	573	74	644	16	338	69	86	2150	1	108	0	4059
St. Paul	1094	99	948	35	741	90	17	1836	0	0	23	4883
Tucson	498	95	1188	26	436	141	28	2555	0	61	0	5028
Tulsa	1053	81	1088	16	88	34	6	3107	9	126	0	5608
Wake County	984	87	544	39	714	31	10	3250	0	28	45	5732
Washington, DC	1201	47	1349	25	714	71	117	3403	16	124	0	7067

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts.

APPENDIX C

FISCAL DATA

Table C-1

Annual Per Student Dollar Expenditures
For Special and Regular Education Programs

	Special Education			Regular Education		
District	1985	1986	1987	1985	1986	1987
Atlanta	4307	4688	Unk	2724	3079	Unk
Baltimore	2431	2780	2874	2406	2569	3240
Chicago	5636	5724	6216	3072	3288	3323
Cleveland	4401	4692	4981	3549	3775	4017
Columbus	4488	5155	5361	3041	3320	3453
Dade County	7342	Unk	Unk	2515	Unk	Unk
Dallas	3995	4085	4320	3215	3249	3319
Denver	11892	10530	Unk	3663	3847	4107
Fresno	3079	3429	3650	3050	3337	3644
Houston	2005	2164	2015	1783	1825	1946
Indianapolis	3235	3517	4125	3001	3102	3444
Long Beach	9136	10152	11035	2906	3095	3511
Los Angeles	4282	4677	5326	2618	2848	3109
Memphis	2510	3298	3335	2159	2216	2479
Milwaukee	4589	4988	5422	2425	2636	2864
Minneapolis	3757	4148	4367	3213	3313	3906
Nashville	Unk	3821	3381	2660	2805	2980
New Orleans	Unk	Unk	2647	Unk	Unk	2380
New York City	8457	9294	10144	4550	4933	5332
Norfolk	2366	2628	3485	3126	3570	3947
Omaha	4494	4915	Unk	2219	2341	Unk
Philadelphia	7328	7465	8151	3508	4034	4134
Phoenix	5293	5334	Unk	1033	1076	Unk
Pittsburgh	3956	4020	4561	3587	3776	4024
Rochester	3995	4359	4969	4391	4686	5236
San Diego	4045	4131	4575	2857	3061	3361
San Francisco	4016	5167	5620	3138	3450	3598
Seattle	3826	3926	4498	3098	3243	3470
St. Paul	5501	6051	6886	2883	3171	3614
Tucson	4464	5125	5313	2588	3014	3155
Tulsa	4339	5458	6256	2982	3084	3259
Average	4438	4882	5312	3041	3273	3558

Note: Per student dollar expenditures are based on costs associated with direct instruction, related services, and administration (for either special or regular education). Costs are not included for transportation, debt services, or capital improvements. The number of students is based on average daily membership for that particular school year.

Unk - unknown, not reported.

APPENDIX D

STUDENT REFERRAL AND PLACEMENT DATA

Table D-1

Annual Special Education Student Referrals and Subsequent Placements

District	1984-85			1985-86			1986-87		
	Refer	Placed	%	Refer	Placed	%	Refer	Placed	%
Baltimore	5344	2672	50.0	5418	2543	46.9	5398	2379	44.1
Chicago	13000	6000	46.2	7538	5805	77.0	12451	9961	80.0
Cleveland	1139	500	43.9	2500	2500	100.0	2250	2250	100.0
Columbus	1501	566	37.7	1670	1250	74.9	1634	1250	76.5
Dade County	3000	1576	52.5	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk
Dallas	1500	1200	80.0	1700	1100	64.7	1800	1125	62.5
Denver	4086	2306	56.4	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk
Houston	Unk	Unk	Unk	5013	4261	85.0	6467	5497	85.0
Indianapolis	1508	710	47.1	633	415	65.6	932	671	72.0
Long Beach	1200	577	48.1	1559	1325	85.0	1383	1176	85.0
Los Angeles	23721	10150	42.4	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk
Memphis	600	550	91.7	1162	929	79.9	1037	830	80.0
Milwaukee	3841	2240	63.0	3819	2416	63.0	3823	2600	68.0
Minneapolis	Unk	Unk	Unk	2618	1057	40.4	3350	1218	36.4
Nashville	Unk	Unk	Unk	2087	1124	53.8	2115	1142	54.0
New Orleans	4356	3030	69.6	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk
New York City	33855	22413	66.2	32052	19796	61.8	33009	22101	67.0
Norfolk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	919	317	34.5
Omaha	2237	1678	75.0	1921	1848	96.2	2140	2059	96.2
Philadelphia	3394	2568	75.7	3350	2970	88.7	5110	4780	93.5
Phoenix	Unk	Unk	Unk	461	98	21.3	379	169	44.6
Pittsburgh	861	782	90.8	861	782	90.8	439	312	71.1
Rochester	3605	280	7.8	3968	2454	61.9	3851	2018	52.4
San Francisco	773	500	64.7	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk
Seattle	808	742	91.8	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk
St. Paul	1400	416	29.7	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk
Tucson	Unk	Unk	Unk	4340	1387	32.0	4337	1187	27.4
Tulsa	3953	1824	46.1	2960	450	15.2	3240	350	10.8
Washington,DC	1664	1308	78.6	Unk	Unk	Unk	2709	1972	72.8
Average	5169	2971	57.5	4741	3106	65.5	5233	3591	68.6

Note: Numbers are based on June 30th counts. Averages exclude missing data.
Refer-number of students referred to special education.
Placed-number of students placed in special education.

Unk - unknown, not reported.

APPENDIX E

COMPLAINT AND HEARING DATA

Table E-1

Number of Special Education Hearings and Complaints

	1984-85 School Year			1985-86 School Year			1986-87 School Year		
District	Comp	Hear	DWon	Comp	Hear	DWon	Comp	Hear	DWon
Atlanta	2	0	NA	5	2	2	14	4	4
Baltimore	150	39	13	110	44	27	124	26	9
Chicago	231	34	31	242	47	44	365	37	30
Cleveland	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	Unk	Unk	Unk
Columbus	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	0	NA
Dallas	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	0	NA
Denver	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	2	0	NA
Fresno	1	1	1	3	0	NA	8	6	4
Houston	5	1	0	4	1	1	2	0	NA
Indianapolis	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	2	1	1
Long Beach	2	2	2	2	0	NA	4	1	1
Los Angeles	176	9	5	157	18	17	135	24	17
Memphis	4	1	1	4	1	0	7	0	NA
Milwaukee	Unk	1	1	Unk	1	1	Unk	1	1
Minneapolis	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	1	0	0
Nashville	Unk	2	1	4	2	1	26	1	0
New Orleans	3	1	1	3	1	0	1	1	1
New York City	861	400	340	903	412	363	860	394	340
Norfolk	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Omaha	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	2	2	2
Philadelphia	Unk	Unk	Unk	59	33	23	85	40	34
Phoenix	1	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	0	NA
Pittsburgh	2	2	2	3	1	1	4	2	2
Rochester	Unk	Unk	Unk	65	42	Unk	25	43	Unk
San Diego	21	0	NA	27	0	NA	31	0	NA
San Francisco	5	0	NA	32	2	1	32	7	2
Seattle	9	4	2	9	3	3	5	1	1
St. Paul	Unk	1	1	Unk	1	1	Unk	0	NA
Tucson	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	1	0	NA
Tulsa	12	2	2	15	2	2	15	2	2
Wake County	0	1	1	1	0	NA	2	0	NA
Washington,DC	292	118	31	231	117	16	155	80	11

Note: Numbers are based on July 1st through June 30th counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported. NA=not applicable.
Comp-number of special education complaints.
Hear-number of hearings conducted in response to special education complaints.
DWon-number of cases in which the district prevailed.

Table E-2

Reasons for Special Education Complaints in 1984-85

District	Diag	Place	Prog Eff	IEP Ser	Rel Ser	Other
Atlanta	1	2	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	15	0	3	0	20
Chicago	63	123	3	40	2	0
Fresno	0	0	0	0	0	1
Houston	0	3	0	2	0	0
Long Beach	1	0	0	0	0	1
Los Angeles	1	4	1	0	1	1
Memphis	0	2	0	2	0	0
Milwaukee	0	0	0	0	1	0
Nashville	0	2	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	1	0	0	0	1	1
New York	211	571	NA	79	NA	0
Norfolk	1	0	0	0	0	0
Phoenix	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pittsburgh	0	2	0	0	0	0
San Diego	0	10	2	0	4	5
San Francisco	0	3	0	0	1	0
Seattle	0	1	0	0	0	3
Tulsa	0	2	0	13	0	1
Washington, DC	0	72	0	0	0	46

Note: Numbers are based on July 1st through June 30th counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported. NA=not applicable.
Diag-disagreements regarding diagnosis of student's handicapping condition.
Place-disagreements regarding appropriateness of placement.
Prog Eff-disagreements regarding effectiveness of program in which student is placed.
IEP Ser-disagreements regarding services included in IEP.
Rel Ser-disagreements regarding provision of related services.

Table E-3

Reasons for Special Education Complaints in 1985-86

District	Diag	Place	Prog Eff	IEP Ser	Rel Ser	Other
Atlanta	1	4	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	4	14	0	1	2	23
Chicago	41	119	6	19	11	48
Fresno	0	0	0	3	0	1
Houston	0	2	0	2	0	0
Long Beach	0	0	0	0	0	2
Los Angeles	3	9	1	0	1	2
Memphis	0	2	0	2	0	0
Milwaukee	1	0	0	0	0	0
Nashville	0	1	0	1	0	0
New Orleans	0	3	0	0	0	0
New York	209	607	NA	87	NA	0
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	1
Philadelphia	5	14	16	3	7	14
Pittsburgh	0	2	0	1	0	0
San Diego	0	12	2	2	3	8
San Francisco	1	6	0	7	4	16
Seattle	0	2	0	0	0	1
Tulsa	0	1	0	15	3	0
Wake County	0	0	0	0	0	1
Washington, DC	0	76	0	0	0	42

Note: Numbers are based on July 1st through June 30th counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported. NA=not applicable.
Diag-disagreements regarding diagnosis of student's handicapping condition.
Place-disagreements regarding appropriateness of placement.
Prog Eff-disagreements regarding effectiveness of program in which student is placed.
IEP Ser-disagreements regarding services included in IEP.
Rel Ser-disagreements regarding provision of related services.

Table E-4

Reasons for Special Education Complaints in 1986-87

District	Diag	Place	Prog Eff	IEP Ser	Rel Ser	Other
Atlanta	1	12	0	0	1	1
Baltimore	1	7	0	2	1	14
Chicago	9	140	19	31	14	152
Denver	0	0	0	1	1	0
Fresno	0	0	0	6	2	0
Houston	0	1	0	1	0	0
Indianapolis	1	0	0	0	0	1
Long Beach	0	1	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	2	19	2	6	2	2
Memphis	4	0	0	3	0	0
Milwaukee	1	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis	0	1	0	0	0	1
Nashville	0	1	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	0	0	0	0	1	0
New York	179	580	NA	101	NA	0
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	1
Omaha	0	1	0	0	0	1
Philadelphia	8	20	27	5	6	19
Pittsburgh	1	2	0	1	0	0
San Diego	1	15	2	1	5	5
San Francisco	0	11	1	5	9	6
Seattle	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tucson	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tulsa	0	1	0	15	3	0
Wake County	0	2	2	0	0	0
Washington, DC	0	48	0	0	0	32

Note: Numbers are based on July 1st through June 30th counts.
Unk=unknown, not reported. NA=not applicable.
Diag-disagreements regarding diagnosis of student's handicapping condition.
Place-disagreements regarding appropriateness of placement.
Prog Eff-disagreements regarding effectiveness of program in which student is placed.
IEP Ser-disagreements regarding services included in IEP.
Rel Ser-disagreements regarding provision of related services.

Table E-5

School District Provision of Legal Services

District	1984-85 Provider	1985-86 Provider	1986-87 Provider
Atlanta	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Baltimore	City Atty.	City Atty.	City Atty.
Chicago	Unknown	Unknown	Dist./Other Atty.
Cleveland	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist./Other Atty.
Columbus	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Dade County	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Dallas	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Denver	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Fresno	Other Prov.	Other Prov.	Other Prov.
Houston	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Indianapolis	Unknown	Dist./Other Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Long Beach	Other Prov.	Other Prov.	Other Prov.
Los Angeles	Other Prov.	Other Prov.	Other Prov.
Memphis	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Milwaukee	City Atty.	City Atty.	City Atty.
Minneapolis	Unknown	Unknown	Dist. Atty.
Nashville	City Atty.	City Atty.	City Atty.
New Orleans	Dist./Other Atty.	Dist./Other Atty.	Dist./Other Atty.
New York City	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Norfolk	City Atty.	City Atty.	City Atty.
Omaha	Other Atty.	Other Atty.	Other Atty.
Philadelphia	Dist./Other Prov.	Dist./Other Prov.	Dist./Other Prov.
Phoenix	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Pittsburgh	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Rochester	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
San Diego	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
San Francisco	Unknown	Other Atty.	City Atty.
Seattle	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
St. Paul	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Tucson	Unknown	Unknown	Dist. Atty.
Tulsa	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Wake County	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.	Dist. Atty.
Washington, DC	Dist./City Atty.	Dist./City Atty.	Dist./City Atty.

Note: Dist. Atty.-school district attorney provides legal services related to special education complaints and hearings.
City Atty.-city attorney provides legal services related to special education complaints and hearings.
Other Atty.-attorneys in city not affiliated with school district or city provide legal services related to special education complaints and hearings.
Other Prov-other individuals who provide legal services related to special education complaints and hearings.

APPENDIX F

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Table F-1

School District Special Education Evaluation Activities in 1985-86

District	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9	E10	Oth
Atlanta	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Cleveland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Columbus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Dade County	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Dallas	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Denver	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fresno	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Houston	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Indianapolis	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Long Beach	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Memphis	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milwaukee	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Minneapolis	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
Nashville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
New York City	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Omaha	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Philadelphia	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Phoenix	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
Rochester	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Francisco	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Seattle	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Paul	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tucson	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulsa	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wake County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Washington, DC	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	30	24	21	18	21	21	12	16	14	8	1

Note: 1=activity conducted in district. 0=activity not conducted in district.

E1-determine compliance with federal, state, and local rules and regulations.

E2-evaluate adequacy of local policies and procedures.

E3-examine actual practice versus stated standards.

E4-demonstrate efficient and effective use of resources.

E5-conduct needs assessment regarding organizational factors.

E6-identify program strengths and weaknesses.

E7-determine worth or merit of program compared to an alternative.

E8-examine effectiveness regarding program outcomes.

E9-examine effectiveness regarding student progress.

E10-provide research-based support for program.

Oth-other evaluation activity.

Table F-2

School District Special Education Evaluation Activities in 1986-87

District	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9	E10	Oth
Atlanta	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Cleveland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Columbus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Dade County	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Dallas	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Denver	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Fresno	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Houston	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Indianapolis	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Long Beach	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Memphis	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milwaukee	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Minneapolis	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
Nashville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
New York City	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Norfolk	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Omaha	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Philadelphia	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Phoenix	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
Rochester	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Francisco	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Seattle	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
St. Paul	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tucson	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulsa	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Wake County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Washington, DC	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Total	31	26	23	24	23	28	12	19	19	11	2

Note: 1=activity conducted in district. 0=activity not conducted in district.
E1-determine compliance w/ fed., state, & local rules & regs.
E2-evaluate adequacy of local policies and procedures.
E3-examine actual practice versus stated standards.
E4-demonstrate efficient and effective use of resources.
E5-conduct needs assessment regarding organizational factors.
E6-identify program strengths and weaknesses.
E7-determine worth or merit of program compared to an alternative.
E8-examine effectiveness regarding program outcomes.
E9-examine effectiveness regarding student progress.
E10-provide research-based support for program.
Oth-other evaluation activity.

Table F-3

Future School District Special Education Evaluation Activities

District	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9	E10	Oth
Atlanta	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Baltimore	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Chicago	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Cleveland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Columbus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Dade County	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
Dallas	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Denver	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
Fresno	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Indianapolis	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Long Beach	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Memphis	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Milwaukee	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
Minneapolis	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Nashville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
New York City	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Omaha	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
Philadelphia	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Phoenix	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Pittsburgh	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Rochester	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
San Diego	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
San Francisco	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Seattle	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
St. Paul	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Tucson	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Tulsa	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Wake County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Washington, DC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Total	22	24	22	26	22	28	23	24	29	27	5

Note: 1=would like to conduct activity in district. 0=not interested in conducting activity in district.
E1-determine compliance w/ fed., state, & local rules & regs.
E2-evaluate adequacy of local policies and procedures.
E3-examine actual practice versus stated standards.
E4-demonstrate efficient and effective use of resources.
E5-conduct needs assessment regarding organizational factors.
E6-identify program strengths and weaknesses.
E7-determine worth or merit of program compared to an alternative.
E8-examine effectiveness regarding program outcomes.
E9-examine effectiveness regarding student progress.
E10-provide research-based support for program.
Oth-other evaluation activity.

Table F-4

School District Special Education Evaluation Criteria in 1985-86

District	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	Oth
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Chicago	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Cleveland	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
Columbus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dade County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallas	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denver	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Fresno	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Indianapolis	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Long Beach	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Memphis	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milwaukee	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Minneapolis	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Nashville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
New York City	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Omaha	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Philadelphia	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Phoenix	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Rochester	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
San Francisco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seattle	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
St. Paul	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tucson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulsa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wake County	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Washington, DC	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	15	9	22	5	12	13	12	3	17	1

Note: 1=evaluation criterion used. 0=evaluation criterion not used.
C1-attendance, graduation, dropout, and suspension rates of handicapped youths.
C2-return to general education.
C3-completion of high school with either a standard or special certificate.
C4-non- and limited English proficient students with disabilities progress at satisfactory rate in spec. and reg. ed. programs.
C5-development of academic competencies.
C6-development of vocational competencies.
C7-development of positive behaviors and attitudes.
C8-development of creative interests and talents.
C9-development of self-help and independent living skills.
Oth-other evaluation criteria used.

Table F-5

School District Special Education Evaluation Criteria in 1986-87

District	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	Oth
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Cleveland	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
Columbus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dade County	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denver	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Fresno	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Indianapolis	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Long Beach	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Memphis	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milwaukee	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Minneapolis	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Nashville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
New York City	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Omaha	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Philadelphia	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Phoenix	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Rochester	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
San Francisco	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Seattle	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
St. Paul	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tucson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulsa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wake County	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Washington, DC	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
Total	17	13	21	8	19	18	15	4	20	1

Note: 1=evaluation criterion used. 0=evaluation criterion not used.
C1-attendance, graduation, dropout, and suspension rates of handicapped youths.
C2-return to general education.
C3-completion of high school with either a standard or special certificate.
C4-non- and limited English proficient students with disabilities progress at satisfactory rate in spec. and reg. ed. programs.
C5-development of academic competencies.
C6-development of vocational competencies.
C7-development of positive behaviors and attitudes.
C8-development of creative interests and talents.
C9-development of self-help and independent living skills.
Oth-other evaluation criteria used.

Table F-6

Future School District Special Education Evaluation Criteria

District	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	Oth
Atlanta	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Baltimore	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Chicago	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Columbus	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Dade County	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Dallas	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Denver	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
Fresno	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Indianapolis	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Long Beach	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Memphis	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Milwaukee	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Minneapolis	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nashville	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New York City	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Norfolk	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Omaha	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Philadelphia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Phoenix	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Rochester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
San Diego	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
San Francisco	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Seattle	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
St. Paul	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Tucson	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Tulsa	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Wake County	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Washington, DC	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Total	22	26	19	15	23	21	20	11	22	3

Note: 1=would like to use evaluation criterion. 0=not interested in using evaluation criterion.
C1-attendance, graduation, dropout, and suspension rates of handicapped youths.
C2-return to general education.
C3-high school completion w/ either standard/special certificate.
C4-non- and limited English proficient students with disabilities progress at satisfactory rate in spec. and reg. ed. programs.
C5-development of academic competencies.
C6-development of vocational competencies.
C7-development of positive behaviors and attitudes.
C8-development of creative interests and talents.
C9-development of self-help and independent living skills.
Oth-other evaluation criteria used.

APPENDIX G

INTEGRATION WITH REGULAR EDUCATION

Table G-1

Number of School Buildings With
Special and/or Regular Education Programs in 1985-86

	Only Sp. Ed.		Only Reg. Ed.		Both	
District	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Atlanta	0	0.0	0	0.0	114	100.0
Baltimore	15	7.9	0	0.0	174	92.1
Chicago	15	2.4	0	0.0	615	97.6
Cleveland	3	2.5	41	33.6	78	63.9
Columbus	3	2.3	0	0.0	126	97.7
Dade County	2	0.8	0	0.0	250	99.2
Dallas	4	2.2	0	0.0	179	97.8
Denver	1	0.9	0	0.0	107	99.1
Fresno	3	3.8	3	3.8	74	92.4
Houston	0	0.0	0	0.0	233	100.0
Indianapolis	2	2.3	0	0.0	83	97.7
Long Beach	3	3.8	0	0.0	75	96.2
Memphis	7	4.4	0	0.0	151	95.6
Milwaukee	4	2.7	0	0.0	142	97.3
Minneapolis	4	5.0	0	0.0	76	95.0
Nashville	6	5.0	0	0.0	113	95.0
New Orleans	4	3.3	4	3.3	115	93.4
New York City	39	3.5	0	0.0	1061	96.5
Norfolk	2	3.4	4	6.8	53	89.8
Omaha	1	1.3	0	0.0	78	98.7
Philadelphia	2	0.8	0	0.0	256	99.2
Phoenix	2	15.4	0	0.0	11	84.6
Pittsburgh	3	3.6	0	0.0	80	96.4
Rochester	0	0.0	0	0.0	48	100.0
San Diego	6	4.0	0	0.0	144	96.0
San Francisco	2	1.6	0	0.0	122	98.4
St. Paul	6	10.9	0	0.0	49	89.1
Tucson	3	3.1	0	0.0	94	96.9
Tulsa	0	0.0	2	2.2	88	97.8
Washington, DC	4	2.2	0	0.0	180	97.8
Average	5	2.8	2	1.0	166	96.1

Note: Building numbers are based on December 1st counts.
Only Sp. Ed.-number of buildings with only special education students.
Only Reg. Ed.-number of buildings with only regular education students.
Both-number of buildings with both special and regular education students.

Table G-2

Number of Regular Buildings With
Special and/or Regular Education Programs in 1986-87

	Only Sp. Ed.		Only Reg. Ed.		Both	
District	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Atlanta	0	0.0	0	0.0	113	100.0
Baltimore	11	6.0	0	0.0	173	94.0
Chicago	15	2.4	0	0.0	597	97.6
Cleveland	3	2.5	41	33.6	78	63.9
Columbus	3	2.3	0	0.0	126	97.7
Dade County	2	0.8	0	0.0	253	99.2
Dallas	4	2.2	0	0.0	176	97.8
Denver	1	0.9	0	0.0	107	99.1
Fresno	3	3.8	3	3.8	74	92.4
Houston	0	0.0	0	0.0	233	100.0
Indianapolis	1	1.2	0	0.0	84	98.8
Long Beach	3	3.8	0	0.0	75	96.2
Memphis	7	4.4	0	0.0	151	95.6
Milwaukee	4	2.7	0	0.0	142	97.3
Minneapolis	4	4.9	0	0.0	77	95.1
Nashville	6	5.0	0	0.0	113	95.0
New Orleans	4	3.3	4	3.3	115	93.4
New York City	39	3.5	0	0.0	1073	96.5
Norfolk	3	5.2	3	5.2	52	89.6
Omaha	2	2.5	0	0.0	78	97.5
Philadelphia	2	0.8	0	0.0	256	99.2
Phoenix	2	15.4	0	0.0	11	84.6
Pittsburgh	3	3.8	0	0.0	61	77.2
Rochester	0	0.0	0	0.0	48	100.0
San Diego	6	3.9	0	0.0	147	96.1
San Francisco	2	1.6	0	0.0	124	98.4
St. Paul	6	1.9	0	0.0	49	89.1
Tucson	3	3.1	0	0.0	94	96.9
Tulsa	0	0.0	1	1.1	89	98.9
Washington, DC	4	2.3	0	0.0	172	97.7
Average	5	2.8	2	1.0	165	96.2

Note: Building numbers are based on December 1st counts.
Only Sp. Ed.-number of buildings with only special education students.
Only Reg. Ed.-number of buildings with only regular education students.
Both-number of buildings with both special and regular education students.

Table G-3

Special Education Student Enrollments
in Different School Settings in 1985-86

	Only Sp. Ed.		Sp. Ed. & Reg. Ed.	
District	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Atlanta	0	0.0	4454	100.0
Baltimore	1463	8.3	16051	91.7
Chicago	1851	3.9	45434	96.1
Cleveland	385	4.9	7500	95.1
Columbus	474	6.9	6344	93.1
Dade County	200	0.8	23800	99.2
Dallas	150	1.7	8907	98.3
Denver	51	1.1	4421	98.9
Fresno	210	4.3	4690	95.7
Houston	0	0.0	15169	100.0
Indianapolis	338	4.9	6521	95.1
Long Beach	396	9.7	3697	90.3
Los Angeles	4675	10.3	40627	89.7
Memphis	482	4.4	10480	95.6
Milwaukee	474	5.4	8276	94.6
Minneapolis	502	9.7	4689	90.3
Nashville	573	9.1	5706	90.9
New York City	6623	6.2	100730	93.8
Norfolk	126	2.9	4139	97.1
Omaha	75	1.3	5515	98.7
Philadelphia	450	2.0	22330	98.0
Phoenix	297	13.9	1841	86.1
Pittsburgh	289	4.6	5951	95.4
Rochester	0	0.0	4471	100.0
San Francisco	110	1.9	5727	98.1
St. Paul	283	6.0	4423	94.0
Tucson	316	6.1	4824	93.9
Tulsa	0	0.0	5776	100.0
Washington, DC	0	0.0	7069	100.0
Average	717	5.0	13433	95.0

Note: Building numbers are based on December 1st counts.
Only Sp. Ed.-number of buildings with only special education students.
Sp. Ed. & Reg. Ed.-enrollments in buildings with both special and regular education students.

Table G-4

Special Education Student Enrollments
in Different School Settings in 1986-87

	Only Sp. Ed.		Sp. Ed. & Reg. Ed.	
District	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Atlanta	0	0.0	3869	100.0
Baltimore	1484	8.3	16287	91.7
Chicago	2042	4.3	46122	95.8
Cleveland	364	4.6	7550	95.4
Columbus	[illegible]	7.1	6233	92.9
Dade County	[illegible]	0.8	24800	99.2
Dallas	288	3.2	8737	96.8
Denver	43	0.8	5027	99.2
Fresno	220	4.1	5080	95.9
Houston	0	0.0	17166	100.0
Indianapolis	228	3.3	6631	96.7
Long Beach	380	9.1	3785	90.9
Los Angeles	4548	9.7	42190	90.3
Memphis	492	4.4	10695	95.6
Milwaukee	502	5.7	8326	94.3
Minneapolis	487	9.5	4619	90.5
Nashville	513	6.6	7262	93.4
New Orleans	265	4.3	5927	95.7
New York City	6167	6.0	96647	94.0
Norfolk	235	5.7	3894	94.3
Omaha	89	1.7	5253	98.3
Philadelphia	421	1.8	22848	98.2
Phoenix	297	14.0	1817	86.0
Pittsburgh	263	5.2	4799	94.8
Rochester	0	0.0	4729	100.0
San Francisco	114	2.1	5321	97.9
St. Paul	311	6.4	4514	93.6
Tucson	309	6.2	4674	93.8
Tulsa	0	0.0	5577	100.0
Washington, DC	619	8.8	6448	91.2
Average	712	5.1	13209	94.9

Note: Building numbers are based on December 1st counts.
Only Sp. Ed.-number of buildings with only special education students.
Sp. Ed. & Reg. Ed.-enrollments in buildings with both special and regular education students.

Table G-5

School District Activities
that Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff in 1984-85

District	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	Total
Atlanta	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	6
Baltimore	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	6
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	8
Cleveland	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	8
Columbus	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Dade County	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
Dallas	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Denver	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
Fresno	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	6
Houston	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Indianapolis	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
Long Beach	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
Los Angeles	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Memphis	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	6
Milwaukee	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	6
Minneapolis	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
Nashville	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	6
New Orleans	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
New York City	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Norfolk	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4
Omaha	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	7
Philadelphia	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
Phoenix	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Rochester	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
San Diego	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	6
San Francisco	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Seattle	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
St. Paul	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	5
Tucson	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	5
Tulsa	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	6
Wake County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Washington, DC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total/Average	18	28	16	28	24	22	19	17	24	5	6.1

Note: 1=yes 2=no
S1-ongoing planning between reg., comp., and spec. education.
S2-special education staff provide training to regular education staff.
S3-regular education staff provide training to special education staff.
S4-spec. ed. staff provide consultation & assistance to reg. ed. teachers.
S5-spec. ed. staff provide follow-up support to reg. ed. teachers of former spec. ed. students.
S6-spec. ed. teachers assigned to grade level grouping/subj. area depts.
S7-spec. ed. dept.is located within central office instructional division.
S8-all administrators receive training on special education programs.
S9-spec. ed. & reg. ed. jointly interview spec. ed. staff candidates.
S10-spec. ed. teachers work with both reg. & spec. education students.
Tot-total number of activities checked.

Table G-6

School District Activities
that Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff in 1985-86

District	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	Total
Atlanta	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	7
Baltimore	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	7
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	8
Cleveland	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	8
Columbus	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Dade County	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
Dallas	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Denver	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	6
Fresno	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	6
Houston	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Indianapolis	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
Long Beach	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
Los Angeles	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Memphis	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	6
Milwaukee	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	6
Minneapolis	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
Nashville	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	6
New Orleans	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
New York City	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	6
Norfolk	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	5
Omaha	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	8
Philadelphia	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Phoenix	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Rochester	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
San Diego	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	6
San Francisco	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Seattle	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	6
St. Paul	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	6
Tucson	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	5
Tulsa	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	6
Wake County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Washington, DC	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	7
Total/Average	20	30	20	31	25	24	19	18	27	6	6.7

Note: 1=yes 2=no
S1-ongoing planning between reg., comp., and spec. education.
S2-special education staff provide training to regular education staff.
S3-regular education staff provide training to special education staff.
S4-spec. ed. staff provide consultation & assistance to reg. ed. teachers.
S5-spec. ed. staff provide follow-up support to reg. ed. teachers of former spec. ed. students.
S6-spec. ed. teachers assigned to grade level grouping/subj. area depts.
S7-spec. ed. dept.is located within central office instructional division.
S8-all administrators receive training on special education programs.
S9-spec. ed. & reg. ed. jointly interview spec. ed. staff candidates.
S10-spec. ed. teachers work with both reg. & spec. education students.
Tot-total number of activities checked.

Table G-7

School District Activities
That Integrate Special and Regular Education Staff in 1986-87

District	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	Total
Atlanta	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	7
Baltimore	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	7
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	8
Cleveland	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	8
Columbus	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Dade County	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
Dallas	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Denver	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	8
Fresno	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	6
Houston	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Indianapolis	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	7
Long Beach	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
Los Angeles	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Memphis	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	6
Milwaukee	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	7
Minneapolis	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
Nashville	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	6
New Orleans	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
New York City	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	7
Norfolk	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	7
Omaha	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	8
Philadelphia	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Phoenix	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
Pittsburgh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Rochester	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	8
San Diego	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
San Francisco	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Seattle	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	8
St. Paul	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	6
Tucson	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	6
Tulsa	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	6
Wake County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Washington, DC	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9
Total/Average	23	29	22	32	26	23	19	20	27	8	7.0

Note: 1=yes 2=no
S1-ongoing planning between reg., comp., and spec. education.
S2-special education staff provide training to regular education staff.
S3-regular education staff provide training to special education staff.
S4-spec. ed. staff provide consultation & assistance to reg. ed. teachers.
S5-spec. ed. staff provide follow-up support to reg. ed. teachers of former spec. ed. students.
S6-spec. ed. teachers assigned to grade level grouping/subj. area depts.
S7-spec. ed. dept.is located within central office instructional division.
S8-all administrators receive training on special education programs.
S9-spec. ed. & reg. ed. jointly interview spec. ed. staff candidates.
S10-spec. ed. teachers work with both reg. & spec. education students.
Tot-total number of activities checked.

Table G-8

School District Activities
That Integrate Special and Regular Education Students in 1984-85

District	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	Total
Atlanta	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Baltimore	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
Cleveland	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
Columbus	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Dade County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6
Dallas	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Denver	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	5
Fresno	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Houston	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Indianapolis	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Long Beach	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Memphis	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
Milwaukee	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Minneapolis	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	5
Nashville	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
New Orleans	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
New York City	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5
Norfolk	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
Omaha	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Philadelphia	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Phoenix	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	5
Pittsburgh	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
Rochester	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
San Diego	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	6
San Francisco	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Seattle	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
St. Paul	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Tucson	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
Tulsa	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
Wake County	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Washington, DC	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total/Average	28	19	6	25	28	31	18	7	4.9

Note: 1=yes 2=no
S1-a common referral system is used to identify all students at-risk.
S2-curriculum development involves both special & regular ed. staff.
S3-the progress of special and regular education students is monitored using one common tracking system.
S4-Learning consultants are available to both spec. & reg. ed. teachers to provide assistance and consultation.
S5-instructional materials & software are used by both spec. & reg. ed.
S6-extracurricular activities are open to both spec.& reg. ed. students.
S7-reg. ed. students serve as peer tutors for spec. ed. students.
S8-reverse mainstreaming is used to place reg. ed. students in special education buildings
Tot-total number of district student integration activities.

Table G-9

School District Activities
That Integrate Special and Regular Education Students in 1985-86

District	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	Total
Atlanta	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Baltimore	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
Cleveland	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
Columbus	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Dade County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6
Dallas	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Denver	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Fresno	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Houston	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Indianapolis	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	4
Long Beach	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Memphis	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
Milwaukee	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Minneapolis	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	6
Nashville	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
New Orleans	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
New York City	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5
Norfolk	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Omaha	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Philadelphia	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Phoenix	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	5
Pittsburgh	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
Rochester	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
San Diego	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	6
San Francisco	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Seattle	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3
St. Paul	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Tucson	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
Tulsa	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
Wake County	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Washington, DC	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Total/Average	28	23	6	25	30	32	22	8	5.3

Note: 1=yes 2=no

S1-a common referral system is used to identify all students at-risk.
S2-curriculum development involves both special & regular ed. staff.
S3-the progress of special and regular education students is monitored using one common tracking system.
S4-Learning consultants are available to both spec. & reg. ed. teachers to provide assistance and consultation.
S5-instructional materials & software are used by both spec. & reg. ed.
S6-extracurricular activities are open to both spec.& reg. ed. students.
S7-reg. ed. students serve as peer tutors for spec. ed. students.
S8-reverse mainstreaming is used to place reg. ed. students in special education buildings
Tot-total number of district student integration activities.

Table G-10

School District Activities
That Integrate Special and Regular Education Students in 1986-87

District	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	Total
Atlanta	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Baltimore	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Chicago	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
Cleveland	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	4
Columbus	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
Dade County	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6
Dallas	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Denver	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Fresno	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Houston	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Indianapolis	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Long Beach	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Los Angeles	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Memphis	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Milwaukee	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Minneapolis	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	6
Nashville	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
New Orleans	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
New York City	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	6
Norfolk	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
Omaha	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Philadelphia	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Phoenix	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	5
Pittsburgh	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
Rochester	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
San Diego	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	6
San Francisco	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Seattle	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3
St. Paul	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Tucson	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	5
Tulsa	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Wake County	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Washington, DC	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	5
Total/Average	30	26	6	26	30	32	23	9	5.5

Note: 1=yes 2=no
S1-a common referral system is used to identify all students at-risk.
S2-curriculum development involves both special & regular ed. staff.
S3-progress of spec. & reg. ed. students monitored using one common tracking system.
S4-Learning consultants are available to both spec. & reg. ed. teachers to provide assistance and consultation.
S5-instructional materials & software are used by both spec. & reg. ed.
S6-extracurricular activities are open to both spec.& reg. ed. students.
S7-reg. ed. students serve as peer tutors for spec. ed. students.
S8-reverse mainstreaming used to place reg. ed. students in spec. ed. bldgs.
Tot-total number of district student integration activities.

APPENDIX H

RECOMMENDATIONS

Table H-1

School District Rankings
of Special Education Policy-Level Recommendations

District	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10
Atlanta	8	5	10	7	3	1	6	4	2	9
Baltimore	2	3	7	4	5	6	8	9	1	10
Chicago	8	9	2	3	1	4	5	7	6	10
Cleveland	5	7	2	1	3	4	10	8	9	6
Dade County	3	2	1	8	10	7	5	9	4	6
Dallas	2	8	7	9	6	4	3	1	5	10
Denver	3	7	1	5	6	8	9	10	2	4
Houston	1	3	10	8	6	4	7	5	9	2
Indianapolis	5	7	9	10	1	2	8	3	4	6
Long Beach	1	5	4	7	3	6	10	8	2	9
Los Angeles	5	1	10	4	3	7	2	8	6	9
Memphis	1	3	9	4	2	5	10	8	6	7
Milwaukee	2	1	8	7	4	3	10	5	6	9
Minneapolis	2	5	10	4	6	1	7	9	3	8
Nashville	2	3	7	4	1	6	5	10	8	9
New Orleans	1	7	9	10	4	5	3	6	2	8
New York City	4	3	10	2	1	8	9	6	7	5
Norfolk	2	4	7	U	6	8	1	5	3	9
Omaha	1	6	2	7	3	4	8	9	5	10
Philadelphia	1	4	7	5	10	3	6	9	2	8
Phoenix	1	2	7	6	8	9	4	10	3	5
Pittsburgh	1	4	6	7	2	3	8	9	10	5
Rochester	1	10	4	5	3	7	9	6	2	8
San Diego	4	7	5	2	1	3	10	9	8	6
Seattle	3	4	10	8	1	7	5	9	2	6
St. Paul	3	10	6	7	1	2	4	8	9	5
Tucson	4	7	10	9	1	2	5	8	3	6
Wake County	4	2	10	9	6	8	5	7	1	3
Washington, DC	1	7	8	9	2	3	10	6	4	5

Note: Rankings are from 1 (most important) to 10 (least important.
R1-explore options for integrating regular, compensatory, and special education programs.
R2-increase opportunities for transitional programs, including from home to school and school to adult.
R3-clarify or revise handicapped conditions.
R4-modify special education referral, evaluation, and placement process.
R5-increase funds to match federal-state program mandates.
R6-increase flexibility for program spending.
R7-disseminate program practices.
R8-investigate the impact of state testing and graduation requirements on special education students.
R9-train regular education administrators and classroom teacher in special education programs and practices.
R10-investigate the impact of extended year programs on special education student progress.

Table H-2

School District Rankings
of Special Education Programmatic Needs

District	I1	I2	I3	I4	I5	I6	I7	I8	I9	I10
Atlanta	1	4	10	8	7	2	5	6	9	3
Baltimore	1	2	10	3	4	5	8	6	9	7
Chicago	8	2	3	4	5	10	9	7	1	6
Cleveland	2	1	3	5	8	6	7	9	10	4
Columbus	1	2	10	7	3	4	6	5	9	8
Dade County	1	5	6	2	3	7	10	4	9	8
Dallas	3	2	6	1	4	7	9	5	10	8
Denver	4	6	3	1	7	9	5	8	2	10
Houston	7	1	2	4	8	3	10	5	9	6
Indianapolis	9	1	10	3	2	4	5	6	7	8
Long Beach	7	2	3	1	6	8	5	4	10	9
Memphis	3	5	9	4	2	6	1	7	10	8
Milwaukee	6	1	7	8	4	5	9	3	2	10
Minneapolis	5	8	10	9	4	6	2	1	7	3
Nashville	2	1	8	3	6	4	10	9	5	7
New Orleans	6	2	9	1	5	8	4	3	7	10
New York City	9	4	2	7	3	1	5	6	10	8
Omaha	9	5	7	1	10	3	2	4	8	6
Philadelphia	5	2	3	1	6	9	7	8	4	10
Phoenix	10	5	9	1	2	3	4	7	8	6
Pittsburgh	7	1	10	5	6	9	8	2	3	4
Rochester	4	2	8	5	6	10	3	1	7	9
San Diego	2	5	6	3	4	7	10	9	1	8
Seattle	2	3	9	7	8	5	10	1	4	6
St. Paul	2	1	3	4	6	5	9	10	8	7
Tucson	1	3	6	2	4	9	5	7	8	10
Wake County	7	1	10	9	6	3	5	2	4	8
Washington, DC	3	8	4	1	2	6	5	7	10	9

Note: Rankings are from 1 (most important) to 10 (least important).
I1-preschool programs for special education students.
I2-programs for severely emotionally disturbed (including assessment, elementary, or secondary).
I3-programs for bilingual special education students.
I4-integration programs for mildly handicapped and regular education students.
I5-vocational programs for special education students.
I6-transition services (including from home to school and school to adult).
I7-development of core curriculum for special education students.
I8-evaluation of special education student progress.
I9-over-representation of minority students in special education programs.
I10-interagency collaboration to provide services to special education students.

Table H-3

Technical Assistance Resource List

CGCS special education directors were asked to indicate their districts' willingness to provide technical assistance to other CGCS districts on ten programmatic issues. The following lists indicate which districts are willing to provide assistance relative to each of the issues.

Special Education Preschool Programs

Baltimore
Chicago
Dade County
Dallas
Fresno
Houston
Indianapolis
Los Angeles
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Philadelphia
Rochester
San Diego
San Francisco
St. Paul
Seattle
Washington, DC

Programs for Severely or Emotionally Disturbed

Chicago
Dade County
Fresno
Los Angeles
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
San Diego
Seattle

Programs for Bilingual, Special Education Students

Dade County
Los Angeles
Minneapolis
New York
Tucson

Integration Programs for Mildly Handicapped and Regular Education Students

Chicago
Denver
Los Angeles
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Nashville
San Francisco
Washington, DC

Vocational Programs for Special Education Students

Los Angeles
Minneapolis
Rochester
San Francisco
St. Paul

Transitional Services for Special Education Students

Dallas
Milwaukee
Nashville
New Orleans
Philadelphia
San Francisco
Washington, DC

Development of Core Curriculum for Special Education Students

Baltimore
Dade County
Houston
Los Angeles
Phoenix
San Diego

Evaluation of Special Education Student Progress

Fresno
Los Angeles
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Rochester

Over-Representation of Minority Students in Special Education Programs

Long Beach
New Orleans

Interagency Collaboration to Provide Special Education Services

Baltimore
Dade County
Dallas
Los Angeles
Minneapolis
Philadelphia
Seattle
St. Paul
Washington, DC

APPENDIX I

SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF

Table I-1

School District Special Education Staff in 1985-86

District	Tchers	Aides	RelSer	Admin	Contr	Other
Atlanta	350	64	11	11	0	84
Baltimore	1422	336	268	41	4	0
Chicago	3801	1119	856	73	4	0
Cleveland	486	123	99	12	0	0
Columbus	507	63	38	26	0	309
Dade County	1426	356	76	23	40	0
Dallas	610	275	193	36	0	30
Fresno	277	140	25	6	0	17
Houston	1233	499	17	237	20	0
Indianapolis	382	90	52	5	4	18
Long Beach	203	154	55	6	3	30
Los Angeles	2206	2952	540	76	0	338
Memphis	564	223	170	18	2	0
Milwaukee	847	184	185	38	0	0
Minneapolis	443	215	101	8	10	25
Nashville	387	91	139	18	48	0
New York City	11679	4726	924	363	131	1845
Norfolk	253	235	67	5	4	11
Omaha	328	161	77	17	0	3
Philadelphia	1958	805	228	44	43	57
Phoenix	229	49	1	4	1	0
Pittsburgh	328	138	44	19	5	0
Rochester	415	183	0	30	0	17
San Diego	703	443	36	16	2	97
San Francisco	345	282	91	6	0	68
Seattle	304	121	82	10	0	29
St. Paul	462	317	199	11	0	0
Tucson	419	227	39	23	4	114
Tulsa	25	25	8	0	1	0
Wake County	314	142	22	9	0	7
Washington, DC	551	210	240	86	33	284

Note: Staff numbers are based on December 1st counts.
Tchers-all special education teachers, regardless of setting.
Aides-all special education aides and paraprofessionals except clerical workers.
RelSer-all special education staff involved primarily in providing related services (as defined by the federal government).
Admin-all special education administrators and supervisors.
Contr-all staff contracted by special education for services.
Other-all other special education staff.

Table I-2

School District Special Education Staff in 1986-87

District	Tchers	Aides	RelSer	Admin	Contr	Other
Atlanta	314	71	11	11	0	84
Baltimore	1473	415	248	46	4	0
Chicago	3903	884	925	75	4	0
Cleveland	487	103	99	12	0	0
Columbus	508	58	41	26	0	308
Dade County	1570	407	80	23	40	0
Dallas	596	269	188	35	0	30
Fresno	290	150	26	6	0	17
Houston	1249	520	17	227	20	0
Indianapolis	401	128	50	5	4	42
Long Beach	209	158	57	7	3	31
Los Angeles	2291	3054	515	125	0	329
Memphis	565	237	175	18	3	0
Milwaukee	860	227	196	39	0	0
Minneapolis	434	219	97	8	12	24
Nashville	395	98	139	15	64	0
New York City	12183	4860	1230	477	214	2038
Norfolk	321	231	76	11	3	11
Omaha	343	171	76	15	0	3
Philadelphia	1870	817	229	64	27	70
Phoenix	149	53	1	4	1	0
Pittsburgh	328	136	44	19	5	0
Rochester	424	197	85	30	0	20
San Diego	719	473	38	15	2	95
San Francisco	355	323	82	8	0	66
Seattle	299	127	88	8	0	29
St. Paul	471	448	213	11	0	0
Tucson	410	231	39	23	4	135
Tulsa	25	25	8	0	1	0
Wake County	326	156	19	10	0	10
Washington, DC	461	426	355	100	49	301

Note: Staff numbers are based on December 1st counts.
Tchers-all special education teachers, regardless of setting.
Aides-all special education aides and paraprofessionals except clerical workers.
RelSer-all special education staff involved primarily in providing related services (as defined by the federal government).
Admin-all special education administrators and supervisors.
Contr-all staff contracted by special education for services.
Other-all other special education staff.

APPENDIX J

STUDENT EXIT DATA

Table J-1

Reasons for Students
Leaving Special Education Programs in 1984-85

District	Gen Ed	Grad	Moved	Private	W/Drew	Too Old	Other
Chicago	6023	1678	1150	558	417	85	0
Cleveland	50	425	5	0	25	5	0
Dade County	600	650	1214	479	1233	20	0
Dallas	854	275	858	0	206	25	0
Denver	384	94	369	0	77	8	0
Indianapolis	85	170	311	5	200	28	0
Long Beach	22	175	90	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	1329	6156	2093	51	6	0	0
Memphis	100	303	0	0	120	547	0
Milwaukee	1022	277	Unk	Unk	140	21	0
New Orleans	175	28	209	87	135	9	0
New York City	3833	1500	4371	1745	5403	257	3351
Philadelphia	1987	1219	998	892	30	145	27
Pittsburgh	86	140	248	104	108	145	0
Rochester	210	19	0	0	0	0	0
San Francisco	222	158	178	88	399	21	0
St. Paul	38	305	26	18	15	23	0
Washington, DC	4	63	57	5	13	29	0

Note: Counts are based on student exits through June 30, 1985.
Gen Ed-students returning to general education.
Grad-graduated from high school with certificate or diploma.
Moved-moved out of district.
Private-entered private or parochial school.
W/Drew-withdrew from school.
Too Old-no longer school age.

Table J-2

Reasons for Students
Leaving Special Education Programs in 1985-86

District	Gen Ed	Grad	Moved	Private	W/Drew	Too Old	Other
Chicago	3623	1210	640	2286	1785	196	0
Cleveland	200	500	50	4	25	2	0
Dallas	397	238	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	541	60	0	0	547	0	0
Indianapolis	297	43	248	8	116	14	0
Long Beach	29	70	Unk	Unk	9	29	0
Los Angeles	1168	806	1541	0	91	133	0
Memphis	124	284	76	0	122	1	0
Milwaukee	1207	279	Unk	Unk	157	17	0
Minneapolis	402	170	479	26	312	0	0
New York City	3664	1631	4917	1230	5648	427	3467
Norfolk	0	85	0	0	232	0	0
Philadelphia	425	1063	941	599	316	63	0
Pittsburgh	85	437	567	126	25	178	0
Rochester	212	51	0	0	0	0	0
Tucson	450	123	0	0	0	15	298
Washington, DC	0	209	0	0	1	3	0

Note: Counts are based on student exits through June 30, 1986.
Gen Ed-students returning to general education.
Grad-graduated from high school with certificate or diploma.
Moved-moved out of district.
Private-entered private or parochial school.
W/Drew-withdrew from school.
Too Old-no longer school age.

Table J-3

Reasons for Students
Leaving Special Education Programs in 1986-87

District	Gen Ed	Grad	Moved	Private	W/Drew	Too Old	Other
Chicago	4240	1443	2024	2258	2435	384	0
Cleveland	200	500	50	4	25	2	0
Dallas	358	238	0	0	0	0	538
Fresno	26	28	16	0	15	18	0
Houston	945	111	0	0	495	0	0
Indianapolis	96	55	254	4	138	13	0
Long Beach	15	84	49	Unk	10	21	6
Los Angeles	1823	1657	2714	0	349	140	0
Memphis	119	298	67	0	102	5	0
Milwaukee	1092	278	Unk	Unk	130	11	0
Minneapolis	474	160	493	15	324	0	0
New York City	3516	1846	5265	1865	7302	274	3797
Philadelphia	481	1188	1182	942	435	61	0
Pittsburgh	83	352	432	102	22	142	0
Rochester	220	62	0	0	0	23	487
San Francisco	29	179	100	0	40	25	10
Tucson	314	131	0	0	0	9	319
Washington, DC	0	279	0	0	49	2	0

Note: Counts are based on student exits through June 30, 1987.
Gen Ed-students returning to general education.
Grad-graduated from high school with certificate or diploma.
Moved-moved out of district.
Private-entered private or parochial school.
W/Drew-withdrew from school.
Too Old-no longer school age.

APPENDIX K

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION DATA

Table K-1

Enrollments of Special and Regular Education Students
in Vocational Education Programs in 1984-85

	Special Education		Regular Education	
District	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Baltimore	1525	8.4	28276	30.2
Chicago	8282	18.4	124700	32.6
Cleveland	479	8.4	5935	8.7
Columbus	324	4.8	5239	8.6
Dade County	7000	32.1	52000	25.2
Dallas	1660	18.4	34534	28.4
Denver	1087	22.6	10157	19.2
Indianapolis	247	3.3	3035	6.5
Long Beach	305	7.5	9700	16.8
Los Angeles	1255	2.7	75000	14.6
Memphis	2220	18.3	29348	31.6
Minneapolis	445	9.2	1768	5.4
Nashville	1217	20.8	16668	29.0
New Orleans	238	2.6	18926	26.2
New York City	8582	7.8	132220	16.1
Omaha	612	10.9	4410	12.2
Philadelphia	2874	11.5	24760	14.3
Pittsburgh	415	7.0	4507	13.1
Seattle	841	19.4	15897	42.9
St. Paul	536	11.4	8849	33.7
Average	2007	11.2	30296	18.1

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts. Vocational education programs are organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment. They do not include one period pre-vocational courses such as home economics, shop, or other exploratory courses or career education courses.

Table K-2

Enrollments of Special and Regular Education Students
in Vocational Education Programs in 1985-86

District	Special Education		Regular Education	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Chicago	9189	19.4	76299	19.9
Cleveland	520	6.6	33724	48.2
Columbus	300	4.4	4699	7.8
Dade County	2557	10.7	16272	7.7
Dallas	2702	30.0	31247	26.4
Denver	1072	24.0	10107	18.3
Houston	2079	13.7	20881	11.7
Indianapolis	133	1.9	2963	6.6
Long Beach	388	9.5	13474	22.6
Memphis	1080	10.7	27722	28.6
Milwaukee	1578	18.0	22190	26.9
Minneapolis	729	14.9	2704	7.9
Nashville	1360	21.7	16644	29.2
New York City	8950	8.0	127378	15.4
Norfolk	1117	25.7	7878	22.9
Omaha	1493	26.7	11871	33.6
Philadelphia	3206	14.1	23207	13.0
Pittsburgh	430	6.7	7193	21.7
Rochester	707	14.9	6282	22.8
San Francisco	675	11.6	2207	3.7
Seattle	728	17.1	8424	21.5
St. Paul	586	12.5	8500	31.5
Tucson	866	16.9	13389	27.8
Tulsa	150	2.6	1033	2.7
Average	1775	12.7	20679	15.8

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts. Vocational education programs are organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment. They do not include one period pre-vocational courses such as home economics, shop, or other exploratory courses or career education courses.

Table K-3

Enrollments of Special and Regular Education Students
in Vocational Education Programs in 1986-87

District	Special Education		Regular Education	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Baltimore	1800	10.1	14372	15.4
Chicago	8746	18.2	77638	20.3
Cleveland	574	7.3	27004	41.3
Columbus	350	5.2	4948	8.3
Dallas	2705	30.1	30581	25.0
Denver	1130	22.3	10200	18.5
Houston	2214	12.9	25995	14.7
Indianapolis	149	2.4	2671	6.0
Long Beach	405	9.7	13782	22.6
Memphis	1103	11.0	26138	27.0
Milwaukee	1638	18.6	19318	23.5
Minneapolis	719	14.7	2566	7.6
Nashville	1256	16.2	17746	31.0
New York City	10526	9.9	28463	15.4
Norfolk	963	23.9	8750	24.4
Omaha	1643	30.8	11745	33.0
Philadelphia	4947	21.3	18617	10.5
Pittsburgh	437	8.4	6904	20.4
Rochester	769	16.3	6417	23.3
San Francisco	611	11.2	2106	3.5
Seattle	813	18.9	7981	20.6
St. Paul	666	13.8	6255	22.7
Tucson	354	7.1	12036	24.4
Tulsa	187	3.3	1055	2.7
Average	1863	13.6	20137	16.0

Note: Enrollments are based on December 1st counts. Vocational education programs are organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment. They do not include one period pre-vocational courses such as home economics, shop, or other exploratory courses or career education courses.